

CA20N  
EAB  
-H26

EA-87-02



# ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT BOARD

VOLUME: 297

DATE: Monday, March 25, 1991

BEFORE:

A. KOVEN Chairman

E. MARTEL Member

FOR HEARING UPDATES CALL (COLLECT CALLS ACCEPTED) (416)963-1249

**FARR**  
ASSOCIATES &  
REPORTING INC.

(416) 482-3277

2300 Yonge St., Suite 709, Toronto, Canada M4P 1E4





HEARING ON THE PROPOSAL BY THE MINISTRY OF NATURAL  
RESOURCES FOR A CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR  
TIMBER MANAGEMENT ON CROWN LANDS IN ONTARIO

IN THE MATTER of the Environmental  
Assessment Act, R.S.O. 1980, c.140;

- and -

IN THE MATTER of the Class Environmental  
Assessment for Timber Management on Crown  
Lands in Ontario;

- and -

IN THE MATTER of a Notice by the Honourable  
Jim Bradley, Minister of the Environment,  
requiring the Environmental Assessment  
Board to hold a hearing with respect to a  
Class Environmental Assessment (No.  
NR-AA-30) of an undertaking by the Ministry  
of Natural Resources for the activity of  
Timber Management on Crown Lands in  
Ontario.

-----  
Hearing held at the offices of the Ontario  
Highway Transport Board, Britannica Building,  
151 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor, Toronto,  
Ontario, on Monday, March 25th, 1991,  
commencing at 9:00 a.m.

-----  
VOLUME 297

BEFORE:

MRS. ANNE KOVEN  
MR. ELIE MARTEL

Chairman  
Member






A P P E A R A N C E S

MR. V. FREIDIN, Q.C.)	MINISTRY OF NATURAL
MS. C. BLASTORAH )	RESOURCES
MS. K. MURPHY )	
MR. B. CAMPBELL )	
MS. J. SEABORN )	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT
MS. B. HARVIE )	
MR. R. TUER, Q.C. )	ONTARIO FOREST INDUSTRY
MR. R. COSMAN )	ASSOCIATION and ONTARIO
MS. E. CRONK )	LUMBER MANUFACTURERS'
MR. P.R. CASSIDY )	ASSOCIATION
MR. H. TURKSTRA	ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
	BOARD
MR. J.E. HANNA )	ONTARIO FEDERATION
DR. T. QUINNEY )	OF ANGLERS & HUNTERS
MR. D. HUNTER )	NISHNAWBE-ASKI NATION
MS. N. KLEER )	and WINDIGO TRIBAL
	COUNCIL
MR. J.F. CASTRILLI )	
MS. M. SWENARCHUK )	FORESTS FOR TOMORROW
MR. R. LINDGREN )	
MS. B. SOLANDT-MAXWELL)	
MR. D. COLBORNE )	GRAND COUNCIL TREATY #3
MS. S.V. BAIR-MUIRHEAD)	
MR. C. REID )	ONTARIO METIS &
MR. R. REILLY )	ABORIGINAL ASSOCIATION
MR. P. SANFORD )	KIMBERLY-CLARK OF CANADA
MS. L. NICHOLLS )	LIMITED and SPRUCE FALLS
MR. D. WOOD )	POWER & PAPER COMPANY
MR. D. MacDONALD	ONTARIO FEDERATION OF
	LABOUR



APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

MR. R. COTTON		BOISE CASCADE OF CANADA LTD.
MR. Y. GERVAIS	)	ONTARIO TRAPPERS
MR. R. BARNES	)	ASSOCIATION
MR. R. EDWARDS	)	NORTHERN ONTARIO TOURIST
MR. B. McKERCHER	)	OUTFITTERS ASSOCIATION
MR. L. GREENSPOON	)	NORTHWATCH
MS. B. LLOYD	)	
MR. J.W. ERICKSON, Q.C.)		RED LAKE-EAR FALLS JOINT
MR. B. BABCOCK	)	MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE
MR. D. SCOTT	)	NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO
MR. J.S. TAYLOR	)	ASSOCIATED CHAMBERS
		OF COMMERCE
MR. J.W. HARBELL	)	GREAT LAKES FOREST
MR. S.M. MAKUCH	)	
MR. J. EBBS		ONTARIO PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS ASSOCIATION
MR. D. KING		VENTURE TOURISM ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO
MR. H. GRAHAM		CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF FORESTRY (CENTRAL ONTARIO SECTION)
MR. G.J. KINLIN		DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
MR. S.J. STEPINAC		MINISTRY OF NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT & MINES
MR. M. COATES		ONTARIO FORESTRY ASSOCIATION
MR. P. ODORIZZI		BEARDMORE-LAKE NIPIGON WATCHDOG SOCIETY



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761116532128>



APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

MR. R.L. AXFORD	CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF SINGLE INDUSTRY TOWNS
MR. M.O. EDWARDS	FORT FRANCES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
MR. P.D. McCUTCHEON	GEORGE NIXON
MR. C. BRUNETTA	NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO TOURISM ASSOCIATION



I N D E X   O F   P R O C E E D I N G S

<u>Witness:</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
<u>ZANE SMITH</u> , Sworn	52804
Direct Examination by Ms. Swenarchuk	52804





I N D E X   O F   E X H I B I T S

<u>Exhibit No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1749	FFT witness statement No. 10.	52797
1750	Source Book re: FFT witness statement No. 10.	52797
1751	Errata sheet re: FFT witness statement No. 10.	52798
1752	CV of Zane Smith.	52798
1753	Hard copies of overheads to be used during Mr. Smith's oral evidence.	52798
1754A	Land and Resource Management Plan for Willamette National Forest.	52799
1754B	Record of Decision re: Willamette National Forest.	52799
1754C	Final Environmental Impact Statement re: Willamette National Forest.	52799
1754D	Appendix I to Final Environmental Impact Statement re: Willamette National Forest.	52800
1754E	Appendix II to Final Environmental Impact Statement re: Willamette National Forest.	52800
1754F	Set of maps consisting of Forest Plan map, trail system map and big game emphasis areas re: Willamette National Forest	52801



I N D E X   O F   E X H I B I T S  
(Cont'd)

Exhibit No.	Description	Page No.
1754G	Seven maps plus overlay map re: alternatives considered for plan of development.	52802
1755	Forest Service document entitled: Regional Guide for the Pacific Northwest Region.	52803
1756	Small scale map of the national forest system overlaying a map of the United States.	52841
1757	20-page document from Greg Hlady, Policy Advisor and Member of People Interested in A Natural Environment consisting of 7-page letter from Mr. Hlady to Premier Rae regarding community-based resource management and a 13-page discussion paper concerning community-based resource management.	52842
1758	99-page document from Ms. Blastorah re information in fulfillment of MNR undertakings given during EAB community hearings in Sault Ste. Marie, Espanola and Timmins, with 5-page document and forest stand map of Geikie Township showing Geikie Lake Road options and amendments from Ms. Blastorah re information in fulfillment of MNR undertaking given during EAB community hearing in Timmins.	52843
1759	Summary of alternatives considered in plan including description of alternatives that occur on alternative maps in Exhibit 1754G.	52906





1 ---Upon commencing at 9:00 a.m.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Good morning.

3 MS. SWENARCHUK: Good morning.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Please be seated.

5 MS. SWENARCHUK: Allow me to introduce  
6 Forests for Tomorrow's last witness before you, Mr.  
7 Zane Smith.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Good morning, Mr. Smith.

9 THE WITNESS: Good morning.

10 MS. SWENARCHUK: I believe our first step  
11 will be numbering exhibits, and I'm sorry I don't have  
12 a list for you this morning.

13 The first I suggest is Mr. Smith's  
14 witness statement, that is Forests for Tomorrow's  
15 witness statement No. 10.

16 MADAM CHAIR: That will be Exhibit 1749.

17 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1749: FFT witness statement No. 10.

18 MS. SWENARCHUK: And next would be source  
19 book to that witness statement.

20 MADAM CHAIR: That will be Exhibit 1750.

21 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1750: Source Book re: FFT witness  
statement No. 10.

22  
23 MS. SWENARCHUK: And small errata sheet.

24 MADAM CHAIR: That will be Exhibit No.  
25 1751.

1 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1751: Errata sheet re: FFT witness  
2 statement No. 10.

3 MS. SWENARCHUK: And Mr. Smith's CV,  
4 1752.

5 MADAM CHAIR: That is four pages, Ms.  
6 Swenarchuk?

7 MS. SWENARCHUK: That's right.

8 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1752: CV of Zane Smith.

9 MS. SWENARCHUK: Then a set of hard  
10 copies of overheads that have been distributed that Mr.  
11 Smith will be using this morning, 1753?

12 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. And that is six  
13 pages?

14 MS. SWENARCHUK: That's right.

15 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1753: Hard copies of overheads to be  
16 used during Mr. Smith's oral  
evidence.

17 MS. SWENARCHUK: And then I believe we  
18 should deal with the Willamette plan.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Which plan?

20 MS. SWENARCHUK: The Willamette National  
21 Forest Plan, 15 pounds of it. (handed)

22 MADAM CHAIR: Thanks, Ms. Swenarchuk.

23 MS. SWENARCHUK: So what I suggest is  
24 that we give it 1754 and then letters for the various  
25 components. So the actual Land Resource Management

1 Plan then I suggest 1754A.

2 MADAM CHAIR: And that is...?

3 MR. FREIDIN: The one with the black  
4 binding on the back.

5 MADAM CHAIR: All right, mm-hmm, that is  
6 1754A.

7 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1754A: Land Resource Management Plan  
8 for Willamette National Forest.

9 MS. SWENARCHUK: That's right. And then  
10 perhaps the Record of Decision which is the smallest  
11 component.

12 MADAM CHAIR: That will be Exhibit 1754  
13 B.

14 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1754B: Record of Decision re: Willamette  
15 National Forest.

16 MS. SWENARCHUK: And the Final  
17 Environmental Impact Statement, another large volume.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Two volumes?

19 MS. SWENARCHUK: The statement is one  
20 volume and then there are two appendices volumes.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. All right. So the  
22 Final Environmental Impact Statement is Exhibit 1754C.

23 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1754C: Final Environmental Impact  
24 Statement re: Willamette National  
Forest.

25 MS. SWENARCHUK: And then Appendix I to

1       that 1754D.

2                   MADAM CHAIR: Can you hold on for a  
3 second, Ms. Swenarchuk.

4                   MS. SWENARCHUK: Sure.

5                   MADAM CHAIR: All right.

6                   MS. SWENARCHUK: Volume I is 1754D and  
7 Appendix II 1754D.

8                   MADAM CHAIR: Now, Exhibit 1754...

9                   MS. SWENARCHUK: Sorry, E.

10                  MADAM CHAIR: 1754D is Volume I  
11 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement, and  
12 Exhibit 1754E is Volume II of the Final Environmental  
13 Impact Statement.

14                  MS. SWENARCHUK: Appendices. And then  
15 there are two sets of maps with the material and the  
16 forest plan maps.

17       ---EXHIBIT NO. 1754D: Appendix I to Final Environmental  
18                               Impact Statement re: Willamette  
                              National Forest.

19       ---EXHIBIT NO. 1754E: Appendix II to Final  
20                               Environmental Impact Statement  
                              re: Willamette National Forest.

21                  MADAM CHAIR: The forest plan maps.

22                  MS. SWENARCHUK: Yes, 1754F. That is  
23 this package, three maps in it, and I don't expect to  
24 be referring specifically to the maps which is why I  
25 suggest one number for this package.



1                   With the other sets of maps I think we  
2 will have to number some of them individually.

3                   MADAM CHAIR: Now --

4                   MS. SWENARCHUK: Okay. This one entitled  
5 Forest Plan Maps has three maps in it, forest plan,  
6 trail system and big game emphasis areas.

7                   MADAM CHAIR: All right. I have four  
8 packages, five packages with that title -- six  
9 packages, so do I have two copies of the three maps  
10 individually.

11                  MS. SWENARCHUK: I can't imagine what you  
12 have actually. I guess everyone out there should have  
13 a copy because as far as I'm aware it's all the same  
14 material. I can't imagine how that happened.

15                  MADAM CHAIR: All right.

16                  MR. FREIDIN: Are those extras, Michelle?

17                  MS. SWENARCHUK: Apparently.

18                  MR. FREIDIN: I need one of the three,  
19 one set of the three.

20                  MS. SWENARCHUK: So I then suggest 1754F  
21 as the set.

22                  MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

23       ---EXHIBIT NO. 1754F: Set of maps consisting of Forest  
24 Plan map, trail system map and  
25 big game emphasis areas re:  
Willamette National Forest.

1 MS. SWENARCHUK: Then we have a set of  
2 alternative maps and we're going to be using some of  
3 these. What I suggest is that we give the package  
4 1754G at this point and we may have to add to that  
5 designation with two maps that we will be referring to,  
6 although we will be referring to one of the forest plan  
7 maps.

8 MADAM CHAIR: All right, Exhibit 1754--

9 MS. SWENARCHUK: G.

10 MADAM CHAIR: --G is a set of -- another  
11 set of maps.

12 MS. SWENARCHUK: Seven maps plus a map  
13 overlay.

14 MADAM CHAIR: All right.

15 MS. SWENARCHUK: Of the alternatives  
16 considered for the plan of development.

17 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1754G: Seven maps plus overlay map re:  
18 alternatives considered for plan  
of development.

19 MS. SWENARCHUK: One more document I  
20 think we may as well exhibit now, was previously also,  
21 and is entitled the Regional Guide for the Pacific  
22 Northwest Region. This is not a component of the  
23 forest plan, it is a Forest Service document.

24 MR. MARTEL: What's the name of that?

25 MS. SWENARCHUK: The Regional Guide for

1 the Pacific Northwest Region.

2 MADAM CHAIR: And do you want another  
3 exhibit number for this?

4 MS. SWENARCHUK: Yes, please.

5 MADAM CHAIR: That will be Exhibit 1755.  
6 And what year was this published?

7 MS. SWENARCHUK: May, 1984 is on it.

8 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1755: Forest Service document entitled:  
9 Regional Guide for the Pacific  
Northwest Region.

10 MADAM CHAIR: And what is the date on the  
11 Willamette National Forest material?

12 MS. SWENARCHUK: Of the decision?

13 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

14 MS. SWENARCHUK: July, 1990. I have an  
15 extra copy of the Regional Guide if any of the parties  
16 need it.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Swenarchuk, was the  
18 summary of the Final Environmental Impact Statement  
19 Exhibit 1754B?

20 MS. SWENARCHUK: Madam Chair, I haven't  
21 filed that summary this morning. Mr. Lindgren says it  
22 was filed during the Forests for Tomorrow wildlife  
23 panel. We can check the number of that exhibit for  
24 you.

25 MADAM CHAIR: All right, thank you. Mr.

1 Pascoe, can you do that? Thank you.

2 MS. SWENARCHUK: Mr. Martel, were you  
3 looking for the CV?

4 MR. MARTEL: No.

5 MS. SWENARCHUK: I think we gave you  
6 another one this morning; did we not? It's on this  
7 recycled paper colour. We have an extra.

8 MR. MARTEL: Thank you.

9 MS. SWENARCHUK: Would you swear Mr.  
10 Smith, please, Madam Chair.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. Mr. Smith, could you  
12 approach us, please.

13 ZANE SMITH, Sworn

14 MS. SWENARCHUK: Perhaps before we begin  
15 reviewing your CV, if you could put on the overhead  
16 with regard to the U.S. Forest Service structure.

17 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. SWENARCHUK:

18 Q. So, Mr. Smith, I understand you're  
19 the third generation forester in your family?

20 A. Yes, I am.

21 Q. And I understand you have a Bachelor  
22 of Science in forestry from the University of Montana  
23 as well as graduate studies in public administration  
24 from Cornell University?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And you spent some time with the  
2 United States Forest Service in 1955, you then spent  
3 three years in the U.S. Air Force and then returned to  
4 the Forest Service?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. And spent your entire career, the  
7 next 32 years, with the U.S. Forest Service?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Until you retired in 1988, and that  
10 is a total of 34 years including temporary times during  
11 your university years?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And you held a number of positions as  
14 forester, as outlined in the CV, and then as of 1965  
15 district ranger as indicated here on the overhead and  
16 that is a first line managerial position?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And could you outline briefly the  
19 duties of that position, please?

20 A. The district ranger is a line officer  
21 in the definition of the Forest Service responsible for  
22 a segment of a national forest.

23 The National Forest runs between a  
24 million to two or three million acres and a national  
25 forest is subdivided into three to seven ranger

1 districts each headed by a professional resource  
2 manager, forester, wildlife biologist, et cetera  
3 responsible for all multiple use activities on that  
4 particular unit of land and accountable back to the  
5 forest supervisor.

6 So in the scheme of Forest Service  
7 organization the district ranger is at the bottom or  
8 operational level with three line officers above that  
9 position.

10 Q. Now, I think you will need to move  
11 the mike in a little more.

12 A. Most certainly.

13 Q. Then, from 1965 to 1967 you were in  
14 Cispus Washington as the Job Corps Conservation Centre  
15 Director and then for a year at Cornell and then you  
16 returned to the field of Forest Service; is that  
17 correct?

18 A. That's right.

19 Q. And from 1968 to 1970 you were the  
20 forest supervisor at the Sierra National Forest, and  
21 I'll ask you to indicate on the overhead what that  
22 position -- where that position ranks in the Forest  
23 Service and outline the duties of the position?

24 A. All right. The forest supervisor is  
25 the administrating head of a national forest unit.



1 He's the supervisor of the district rangers and  
2 overseas the multiple activities on a national forest.

3 The national forest typically is a  
4 million to three to four million acres. There are  
5 exceptions to that, but that would be the average.

6 There are 156 national forests in the  
7 national forest system. The forest supervisor is again  
8 a professional, normally one who has worked up through  
9 the ranks in a resource capacity as a forester.  
10 Possibly an engineer, wildlife biologist, landscape  
11 architect, geologist, a number of disciplines will  
12 qualify.

13 That individual has headquarter staff  
14 made up of various resource specialists, program  
15 managers such as for timber, recreation, wildlife, an  
16 administrative section that deals with budget,  
17 personnel.

18 A forest supervisor can have anywhere  
19 from a couple of hundred employees up to a thousand  
20 depending on the size of the unit. It is the planning  
21 and the supervisory level of the Forest Service that  
22 overseas the operational work of district rangers.

23 Q. All right. Then from 1970 to 1974  
24 you were the forest supervisor of the Willamette  
25 National Forest?



1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Now then, from 1974 to '78 you were a  
3 director of recreation management at the national level  
4 working from Washington and can you explain to the  
5 Board, please, what your duties were in that position?

6 A. Again, I was a director of recreation  
7 management which included a number of activities  
8 associated with that, the wilderness, the trail system  
9 for the national forest, the visitor information  
10 interpretive services, cultural and archaeological  
11 resources, what we would call special uses.

12 These are similar to leases of national  
13 forest lands for various kinds of recreation  
14 development and use such as ski areas. For example,  
15 Vail and Aspen in the United States are national forest  
16 facilities under a special use permit.

17 The director of recreation is a part of  
18 this headquarter staff at the national level. The  
19 chief of the Forest Service is the administrative head  
20 of the Forest Service, he has deputy chiefs, five of  
21 them; one for national forest system, one for research,  
22 et cetera. The director of recreation management  
23 reports to a deputy chief, deputy chief for national  
24 forest system then reports to the chief of the Forest  
25 Service.

1                   The responsibility there is to provide  
2   staff support to the chief on matters of policy and  
3   budget, to represent the chief in matters before the  
4   Congress or other agencies or other groups in terms of  
5   recreation responsibilities, to provide program  
6   guidance to the field; that is, to the regional  
7   foresters, to the forest supervisors and district  
8   rangers through the chain of command.

9                   Q.   Thank you.   And then from '78 to '87  
10   you were the regional forester in the Pacific  
11   Southwest, and I would like you to explain your duties  
12   in that position, please?

13                  A.   This is where the regional forester  
14   fits into the picture.   There are nine regional  
15   foresters that oversee the national forest system work  
16   of the Forest Service.   The regional forester for the  
17   Pacific Southwest region is headquartered in San  
18   Francisco California and is responsible for the  
19   national forest in California which amounts to 20  
20   million acres.   You'll have to forgive me, I'm not  
21   quick to convert to hectares but 2.4 acres equal a  
22   hectare.

23                  MR. MARTEL:   Some of us aren't quick with  
24   hectares.

25                  THE WITNESS:   Thank you.   The rest of the

1 area of geographic responsibility includes Hawaii and  
2 Micronesia, the trust territories of Micronesia which  
3 now have more or less a free association with the  
4 United States.

5 The responsibilities in the islands are  
6 primarily what we call state and private forestry. You  
7 would say it's more or less forestry assistance, some  
8 grants, federal grants but primarily technical forestry  
9 assistance, and that is the case for California as  
10 well.

11 So the regional forester deals with the  
12 state forestry organizations, Hawaii, California in  
13 this case, and the territorial or other island  
14 governments and forestry organizations in Micronesia.

15 The regional forester, again like the  
16 district ranger forester supervisor or chief is  
17 responsible for all activities. The big job of course  
18 was managing national forests of California of which  
19 there are 18 comprising 20-million acres which is one  
20 fifth the entire land base of California, a relatively  
21 large state.

22 That particular position is complex  
23 because of the very large population. While I was  
24 there there was 27-million people living in California  
25 and it has grown to 30-million now, largely urban

1 people but a very large land base of wildlands managed  
2 for a variety of uses.

3 Timber, this particular region produces  
4 the second largest timber production in our national  
5 forest system, a very high level of recreation use, a  
6 large wilderness element, water being critical in that  
7 part of the United States the national forests were the  
8 generators of about 60 per cent of all the water in  
9 California, wildlife, grazing, mining, you know, the  
10 whole range of multiple use activities on that  
11 relatively large land base.

12 The regional forester provides leadership  
13 to a large workforce, about 500 to 700 people,  
14 depending on the time of decade I was there, in the  
15 headquarters office made up of specialists and program  
16 managers for various resources and also various support  
17 activities such as personnel, budget, policy analysis,  
18 computers and all of that, plus the 18 national forests  
19 each headed by a forest supervisor.

20 All in all, my direct supervision was for  
21 42 people, that is the people that reported directly to  
22 me not through somebody else to me. That comprised the  
23 management team for the Pacific Southwest region.

24 A budget of about a third of a billion  
25 U.S. dollars, revenues generated on the order of about

1 one quarter of a million dollars primarily from timber  
2 sale receipts. I think I'll let it stand there.

3 Q. Now, before we move to the national  
4 recreation strategy work, I understand that as of 1974  
5 you were, I think we would say classified in Canadian  
6 terminology, a member of the senior executive service  
7 and federal public service and that you retained that  
8 status for the 14 years remaining until you left the  
9 Forest Service?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. And could you just briefly explain to  
12 the Board what the senior executive service is?

13 A. In the mid-1970s a decision was made  
14 in our civil service system to create what is called a  
15 senior executive service made up of the very top senior  
16 graded people in government. This applied across  
17 government wide, not just to the Forest Service.

18 The level of regional forester and above,  
19 including the directors at the headquarter staff, were  
20 in those grades. They became, as I did, chartered  
21 members of the senior executive service and as Michelle  
22 points out, I remained at that level for the remainder  
23 of my career.

24 It was created primarily to provide  
25 mobility within the senior levels of government



1 management to allow people to move from agency to  
2 agency, assuming that people at that level all had a  
3 basic level of managerial experience and skill. So  
4 that the regional forester and above on that chart in  
5 terms of the top positions are senior executive  
6 positions.

7 Q. And now turning to your work in 1987  
8 to '88, as you've indicated on the C V., the big  
9 responsibility was to develop a national recreation  
10 strategy for the Forest Service, and we will be coming  
11 back to the national recreation strategy later.

12 Could you outline now briefly for the  
13 Board what that was, what your function was in  
14 developing that strategy?

15 A. I need to give you a brief background  
16 of why we embarked on the development of a strategy.

17 It was the feeling of the chief and many  
18 of the regional foresters that the Forest Service'  
19 credibility as a multiple use agency was being eroded  
20 by a number of controversies and conflicts and in fact  
21 there was a general public dissatisfaction with what  
22 they perceived to be the multiple use application of  
23 the Forest Service.

24 We surmised that it was not the concept  
25 of the multiple use as much as the way the Forest

1 Service was applying it or practising it on the ground  
2 and that dissatisfaction manifested itself in a great  
3 deal of -- great number of appeals, great deal of  
4 litigation and subsequently legislation that began to  
5 take away from multiple use as a concept for the  
6 national forest system; that is, a lot of single use  
7 legislation, and the background of that was a  
8 dissatisfaction on the part of the public and many  
9 groups that the national forests were managed primarily  
10 for timber at the expense of other resources.

11 I think the Forest Service was caught up  
12 in a period of rapid public change in attitude and it  
13 was unable to keep up with it, being a very large  
14 organization, about 32,000 people, and very  
15 decentralized, most of the people were in the field, it  
16 was just unable to respond rapidly enough to satisfy  
17 that.

18 So Dale Robertson who was the chief of  
19 the Forest Service at that time and I discussed this,  
20 and I was nearing the end of my career, and he asked me  
21 if I would be willing to lead an effort that would help  
22 restore credibility to multiple use and help restore a  
23 balance to Forest Service management practices because  
24 recreation is a highly visible activity in any resource  
25 management program, it's the one that touches the



1 customers direct, it's not going through an industry to  
2 provide a product indirectly.

3 We chose recreation as a means to do  
4 that, and I was given about six months to develop a  
5 recreation strategy for the Forest Service, and that is  
6 about the size of my direction, but I had in my mind  
7 improving the credibility of multiple use and leveraging  
8 the Forest Service into a little more rapid change.

9 I then organized an effort to develop the  
10 strategy using principally Forest Service people from  
11 around the system. I used volunteers, about 60  
12 volunteers scattered from Puerto Rico to Alaska and we  
13 divided the work up into various elements of recreation  
14 concern, like the customer, like marketing, like  
15 technology, like the resource itself. These  
16 commissions then developed recommendations which led to  
17 a national symposium made up of Forest Service and  
18 outside people, at which time we sort of revamped the  
19 way in which we approached recreation and integrated it  
20 into our other activities, and that has subsequently  
21 resulted in a strategy that has been published and one  
22 that has been implemented and serves as a model for  
23 other resource programs like range and timber and  
24 wildlife to enhance the integration, improve the true  
25 multiple use performance of the Forest Service.

1 Q. And I understand that you have become  
2 a member of the Forest Service Chiefs Management Team  
3 for Decision-Making and are involved in discussions  
4 pertaining to major decisions?

5 A. That is true, in that regional  
6 foresters really are a part of the Forest Service top  
7 management team. Just as a forest supervisor is a part  
8 of a regional forester's management team in running a  
9 region, so are regional foresters.

10 In my capacity in that job I became a  
11 part of the policy-making group of the Forest Service  
12 with the chief and his deputy chiefs at the national  
13 level.

14 Q. Now, in addition since leaving the  
15 Forest Service I understand you continued your  
16 involvement with forestry matters as a consultant?

17 A. Yes, I serve was as a consultant in  
18 matters much like this. I am presently working on a  
19 small team with our Bureau of Land Management which is  
20 another large public land manager in the U.S. on a  
21 guideline to help them develop a biodiversity  
22 alternative for their western Oregon forest lands.

23 I also serve as a kind of almost a  
24 full-time volunteer for the American Forestry  
25 Association which is a large citizens conservation

1 group in the United States, I serve as their Pacific  
2 representative, primarily a contact point, and a  
3 position that advocates multiple use and good  
4 conservation.

5 Q. And during the years of your career  
6 you have lectured widely I believe, and I wonder if you  
7 could tell the Board briefly some of the topics on  
8 which you've lectured and where you've done that?

9 A. Right. In my capacity both as  
10 director of recreation and as regional forester I was  
11 invited because of those positions to lecture at  
12 various universities. I have participated in numerous  
13 seminars at Berkeley, University of Oregon, various.  
14 places around the country. I have been to Harvard,  
15 Cornell to talk on a variety of things but usually  
16 policy relating to forestry, natural resources and the  
17 role of the Forest Service in managing the public  
18 lands.

19 I still do that in my capacity with the  
20 American Forestry Association, primarily at the Pacific  
21 Northwest University.

22 Q. And also in addition to your Forest  
23 Service role you have been involved with the IUCN,  
24 International Union for Conservation of Nature. Can  
25 you explain briefly your involvement with that?

1                   A. Right. IUCN is an interesting  
2       national organization headquartered in Switzerland that  
3       advocates conservation and protection of natural  
4       resources. It's made up of governmental and  
5       non-governmental entities. Canada is well represented  
6       at the IUCN.

7                   The Forest Service was a member of IUCN  
8       and since the middle 70s I have been the -- one of the  
9       Forest Service representatives for IUCN meetings and  
10      commission activities.

11                  I was a member of the National Parks and  
12      Protected Areas Commission. That label is not  
13      descriptive because it includes such things as national  
14      parks and national forests and then other kinds of  
15      reserves for public uses.

16                  Interestingly enough the commissioner --  
17      the chairman of that commission is a Canadian, Harold  
18      Erdsvic of the Parks Canada group, but the Forest  
19      Service represented kind of the principal multiple use  
20      perspective in IUCN and on the commission and I served  
21      for -- during my career from about 1976 until I retired  
22      as a representative and commission member.

23                  Q. And then on the fourth page of the CV  
24      that was distributed this morning to your resume  
25      supplement from last September, in the second paragraph

1 from the bottom of the page you've indicated that you  
2 led the first government pilot program in Tom Peters  
3 In Search of Excellence, and I wonder if you could  
4 explain that process, please, including why your area  
5 was chosen to be given?

6 A. All right. You may recall that a few  
7 years ago Peters and Waterman wrote a book called In  
8 Search of Excellence that became kind of a standard in  
9 some ways of organizing and managing large  
10 organizations.

11 It drew upon the private sector  
12 principally, however, during my tenure as regional  
13 forester, the government with the people that were  
14 running the In Search of Excellence management seminars  
15 wanted to pilot run some governmental activity in it.

16 I was a member of the bay area, the San  
17 Francisco bay area federal executive board which, for a  
18 large segment of the western part of the country,  
19 represented the various federal agencies and the office  
20 of personnel management.

21 The arm of government that deals with our  
22 civil service commission was looking for an agency to  
23 pilot run In Search of Excellence seminars in the  
24 development program. They selected the Forest Service  
25 because I think the Forest Service has a good



1 reputation of being a well run organization and  
2 somewhat progressive and selected the Pacific Southwest  
3 Region as a good example of that reflection.

4 We then took our top management team,  
5 which was the 42 people I mentioned to you, the forest  
6 supervisor, myself and my principal staff in San  
7 Francisco and went through this developmental program  
8 which involved, you know, a sizeable period of time,  
9 probably about six months to a year, to go through a  
10 number of exercises and practices.

11 As a result of that we received some  
12 recognition of excellence from the federal executive  
13 board and the office of personnel management for having  
14 achieved that and then actually implemented it.

15 Q. You also indicated in the same  
16 paragraph that you helped pioneer the Forest Service  
17 futuring program which resulted in development of a  
18 vision statement and the streamlining of organization  
19 and management in response to budget reductions. And  
20 could you outline that program, please?

21 A. Yes. In the 80s the Forest Service  
22 was faced with two major issues, one was of large  
23 budget reductions - which I'm sure is not uncommon  
24 around the rest of the world - and a changing attitude  
25 on the part of the public about what its public lands



1       ought to be managed for, and I described the, you know,  
2       environment of controversy and debate surrounding that.

3               We felt in order to accelerate change we  
4       must change or perish in this respect, that we needed  
5       to do some futuring, we needed to look into the future  
6       and ask ourselves what kind of vision we should be  
7       moving toward.

8               We worked with a number of consultants  
9       and experts in this field and, as I say -- as Michelle  
10      said, we kind of pioneered the effort in the Forest  
11      Service.

12              Being in the California environment  
13      helped us because in the United States that's where  
14      some kind of leading edge things occur, so we were  
15      getting it before some other folks were. But we then  
16      went through a series of exercises that involved really  
17      thousands of people within the workforce of our region  
18      identifying trends, trying to interpret those trends  
19      and then, given all of that, to develop a vision that  
20      would help drive the Forest Service towards excellence  
21      in the future.

22              We did publish this after about a year of  
23      developing it and it still provides the basic guidance  
24      in concert with budgets, targets and objectives and so  
25      forth that run the Forest Service in that region, and

1 then the Forest Service nationwide adopted a similar  
2 process that led to a program of vision making and then  
3 driving programs towards that vision.

4 MS. SWENARCHUK: Those are all my  
5 questions for Mr. Smith, Madam Chair, and I'm asking  
6 that he be qualified as an expert in forest resource  
7 management -- forest resource integrated management,  
8 forest resource integrated planning and as an expert in  
9 organizational development in large organization.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Could you repeat that, Ms.  
11 Swenarchuk, please?

12 MS. SWENARCHUK: As an expert in  
13 organizational development in large organizations.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Are there any objections  
15 from the parties with respect to qualifying Mr. Smith  
16 as an expert in forest resource integrated management,  
17 forest resource integrated planning and as an expert in  
18 organizational development in large organizations?

19 No objections?

20 MR. COSMAN: Certainly not. Madam Chair,  
21 with respect to organizational development in large  
22 organizations, I understand the witness to have  
23 expertise in the organizational development of  
24 certainly one large organization, I don't know whether  
25 he has general expertise with other large organizations

1 and perhaps if he's being in a generic way qualified as  
2 an expert, we should hear what other expertise he has  
3 in large organizations beyond the Forest Service.

4 MS. SWENARCHUK: Madam Chair, as Mr.  
5 Smith has told you, he spent 34 years of his career in  
6 the Forest Service in various capacities and I don't  
7 propose to -- I'm not suggesting that he's functioned  
8 in other organizations as well, that however of course  
9 is one component of a much larger organization, the  
10 United States Public Service, and I think on that basis  
11 and on the basis of his experience as a senior manager  
12 in leading branches of both the Forest Service, which  
13 is large in itself, and the U.S. Public Service, which  
14 is that much larger, that qualification is appropriate.

15 Do you want to add any comment, Mr.  
16 Smith?

17 THE WITNESS: I can certainly respond to  
18 that. I think it's a legitimate question. Let me  
19 offer two or three things that suggest a broader  
20 application than just the Forest Service.

21 Let me say, first of all, that the Forest  
22 Service is recognized in the United States as a well  
23 run organization, a model of management in  
24 organization, it has lots of faults, but it still has  
25 held up and there's been several books published on

1       this and papers.

2                   Let me offer that my United States Air  
3       Force experience added to this broadening. I retired  
4       from the United States Air Force as a reserve officer  
5       in the mid-1970s, so I accumulated about a total of 17  
6       years in that organization, certainly not full-time,  
7       but in and out of it, so that I had the benefit of that  
8       kind of exposure.

9                   The senior executive service by  
10      definition requires certain qualifications that are  
11      generic. You can't say that they're generic in terms  
12      of private sector necessarily, I think there is a lot  
13      of crosswalk between them, but certainly among the vast  
14      government array of agencies, senior executive service  
15      members are thought to be interchangeable with a variety  
16      of positions.

17                  Now, it would not be very practical to  
18      put me in the judicial branch or health and education,  
19      but I still think there's a fairly high level of  
20      confidence that these senior executives could be  
21      successful managers at that level in almost any  
22      endeavour.

23                  I went through the Federal Executive  
24      Institute which is a graduate level program,  
25      residential program designed for federal executives and

1 I have that in my credentials.

2 In addition to that, during my job corps  
3 days I worked with the OEO, Office of Economic  
4 Opportunity. This was the program under the Johnson  
5 administration that dealt with human social problems  
6 and I got fairly we immersed in that even to the level  
7 of the vice-president of the United States working on  
8 his staff in the President's Council on Yuouth  
9 Opportunity exposed to urban matters and so forth.

10 Lastly I would say that I've personally  
11 been recognized by both government and non-governmental  
12 entities as somebody that has something to offer  
13 because of my lecture circuit. I have lectured top  
14 managers in both private and governmental entities on  
15 In Search of Excellence, in futuring and I just offer  
16 that as some evidence that it's recognized.

17 MS. SWENARCHUK: That satisfies you, Mr.  
18 Cosman?

19 MR. COSMAN: Certainly in the context of  
20 those answers, Madam Chair, I'm satisfied with the  
21 witness' qualifications.

22 MS. SWENARCHUK: Thank you.

23 Q. Now then, turning finally to your  
24 testimony, Mr. Smith, I would like to start, Mr. Smith,  
25 by asking for your response to a question that the



1 Board asked us in the scoping session about a month ago  
2 and that was the question of how comparable the land  
3 area is between the U.S. forest system and the area of  
4 the undertaking, specifically how much of the land area  
5 of the U.S. forest system is forest as opposed to range  
6 lands.

7 A. Right. Let me turn to this map.  
8 This is very difficult for you to see. I think it was  
9 offered as an exhibit somewhere along the line.

10 This map outlines the United States and  
11 perhaps you can see the dark green and this darker  
12 amber colour represents the national forest system.  
13 The national forest system is comprised of 156 national  
14 forests and 19 national grasslands, and that is  
15 referred to as the national forest system. It's a  
16 system not unlike the national park system or the  
17 national wildlife refuge system, it's just a system of  
18 lands that are managed for different purposes under  
19 statute.

20 Anyway, you can see that they are  
21 scattered all over, from Rico company to Alaska,  
22 primarily in the western United States although there  
23 are 20-million acres within the eastern portion of the  
24 United States. That 19.1-million acres equates to 77.3  
25 hectares.



1 Q. Million?

2 A. Pardon me.

3 Q. 77.3-million.

4 A. Million in hectares, yes, and we had  
5 a little trouble comparing that to Ontario, but  
6 apparently there are 38.5-million hectares of forest  
7 lands in Ontario that this undertaking is dealing with.  
8 When you add the water to it it's 40-million or --  
9 anyway, it appears to me that the lands managed between  
10 the two agencies, there's about twice as much national  
11 forest land but, of course, it's scattered over a very  
12 large area; that is not to say it's identical or even  
13 resembles the same, you know, biological  
14 characteristics, and I don't want to represent myself  
15 as an expert in your resources, I represent myself as  
16 someone who is dealing with the process and policy  
17 matters.

18 Within the 77.3-million hectares of  
19 national forest about 24-million hectares are  
20 considered suitable timber lands. That is not to say  
21 that there are not other forest lands, there may be  
22 alpine land and brushlands, the foothills that are  
23 characterized by species that are not normally  
24 considered commercial timber, but there's considered to  
25 be about 24-million hectares of more or less commercial

1 forest land.

2 There's another 20-million hectares of  
3 grazing lands. These are lands that are principally  
4 grazing lands, that would include 19 national  
5 grasslands, and then a lot of foothills and alpine  
6 meadows and that sort of thing that, you know, the  
7 primary feature there is grass, grass and forbs and  
8 shrubs.

9 There's also 13-million hectares of  
10 wilderness, and I say that with the capital W. These  
11 are designated wilderness lands designated by the U.S.  
12 Congress and are in statute. These wilderness lands of  
13 course also contain forest and grazing lands and ice  
14 and snow and water, what have you.

15 There's an additional 20-million acres  
16 that are considered unroaded, and our strategic  
17 planning would indicate that about half of those  
18 20-million hectares will eventually become wilderness  
19 and the other half designated to other kind of multiple  
20 uses including timber.

21 Okay. These national forests vary in  
22 size a great deal. I mentioned earlier that they  
23 average a million to two or three million acres.  
24 Actually they run all the way from the 17-million acre  
25 or 3.6-million hectare Tongas National Forest in

1 southeast Alaska to a very small 154-hectare National  
2 Forest in California referred to as the Calaveras, Big  
3 Tree.

4 Some of these national forests, the  
5 smaller ones, are administered as part of larger units,  
6 two or more national forests, that is particularly the  
7 case in the southeast part of the United States where  
8 you have several national forests that make up one  
9 administrative unit; for example, the National forest  
10 of North Carolina are really several national forests,  
11 smaller ones.

12 Q. I believe you also have some figures  
13 for softwood removed from national forests in the U.S.;  
14 do you not?

15 A. Yes, I do. Let me talk a little bit  
16 about softwood, both growing stock and production.  
17 These are 1987 data -- 1986 and '87 data.

18 The national forest contains about 41 per  
19 cent of the national softwood growing stock. Added to  
20 the other public lands, the public lands contain  
21 probably about half of the softwood growing stock in  
22 the United States, the rest of it is forest industry  
23 lands, about 16 per cent, and farmers and other sort of  
24 small non-industrial holdings that represent about 30  
25 per cent. So the public lands are about 50 per cent,

1 the private lands are about 50 per cent, the national  
2 forests were running about 41 per cent. That's what's  
3 out there.

4 Now, in production the national forests  
5 are producing about 18 per cent or, in million cubic  
6 feet, about 11 thousand -- 11.3 or four million cubic  
7 feet. It's hard to even fathom what that means, but  
8 it's a lot of wood, and the national forests produce  
9 about 18 per cent of that.

10 My notes here indicate that the national  
11 forests produce 58-million cubic metres of wood.  
12 Ontario's forests, if I have this correct, is about  
13 20-million cubic metres. The national forest system  
14 produce a little less than three times as much softwood  
15 as the Crown lands of Ontario, to give you some  
16 perspective.

17 Now, the apparent discrepancy between the  
18 national forest having, you know, 40 some per cent of  
19 the growing stock and only producing 18 per cent of the  
20 nation's needs has to do with objectives. The private  
21 forest lands, their objectives are primarily economic.  
22 It's not totally the case because there are a lot of  
23 small landowners and farmers who manage those lands for  
24 other values, but the Weyerhaeusers of the United  
25 States and the Louisiana Pacifics, you know, the large

1 companies are primarily in the business of growing wood  
2 for economic purposes, and that is why the national  
3 forests appear not to be producing their fair share,  
4 it's because that fair share is diminished for other  
5 kinds of resource values and uses.

6 We don't cut timber in wilderness and we  
7 modify our timber practices to accommodate other kinds  
8 of multiple resource values such as wildlife,  
9 biodiversity and so forth. Okay.

10 Q. Now, we're going to come in a moment  
11 to the Board's question about planning processes on  
12 private lands, but could you first please, having given  
13 the Board a sense of the volume harvest on national  
14 forests, could you now, using the overhead - this is  
15 now page 2 of the hard copy of overheads, Exhibit  
16 1753 - give the Board an indication of the area  
17 harvested on national forest lands?

18 A. Remember we're talking about  
19 77.3-million hectares of lands, a fairly large timber  
20 harvest program. These are data that were developed as  
21 part of our national strategic plan which is the  
22 Resources Planning Act program for the Forest Service  
23 and what we have here are various years, 1989, 1995 and  
24 the year 2040 which purports to our planning framework  
25 and looking ahead.



1                   There are two types of silviculture  
2     treatments, broad types, clearcutting and partial cut.  
3     In 1989, as you can see, the area cut in thousands of  
4     hectares was 130-thousand hectares clearcut to produce  
5     10.6-billion board feet. The amount partially cut was  
6     230-thousand hectares.

7                   The interesting thing about this chart is  
8     that although clearcutting will remain, you know, a  
9     major tool of timber harvesting in the national forest  
10    it is certainly trending down and in 1995 you can see  
11    that it is reduced to 107, where partial cutting is  
12    going up to 244 in the 50-year time frame that we see  
13    moving towards this, clearcutting will be reduced to  
14    94-thousand hectares and partial cut raised to  
15    364-thousand hectares as the timber harvest -- actually  
16    the amounts go up.

17                  Part of that is taking advantage of  
18    technology, genetically improved forests that are  
19    managed forests, better access to recover, salvage and  
20    so on.

21                  Q. Thank you. Now, we will turn to the  
22    question of planning processes and management on  
23    private lands.

24                  The Board asked us -- given the  
25    predominance in terms of percentage production from

1 private lands, the Board has asked us what planning  
2 approaches are used on private lands, are any changes  
3 anticipated in planning on private lands, and does  
4 anything like the U.S. Forest Service planning approach  
5 apply on private lands?

6 A. Right. The private lands rights in  
7 the United States are very well established and there's  
8 a lot of tradition involved in what people can do with  
9 their lands and what they can't. United States  
10 citizens value the bundle of private lands rights, so I  
11 want to give you that as a kind of backdrop to this  
12 whole thing.

13 There is no comparable planning activity  
14 to my knowledge to the Forest Service plans for the  
15 national forest for private lands. Each of the 50  
16 states has a state forester and a state forestry  
17 organization that is a part of the state government.  
18 Those state forestry departments generally manage some  
19 state owned lands, the public lands, and generally for  
20 multiple use purposes, and they also provide the  
21 regulation for timber harvest and other activities on  
22 privately owned forest lands.

23 They offer technical assistance to some  
24 degree, dollar assistance through grants and cost  
25 sharing, and this is where the Forest Service working

1 with the state forester offers technical assistance and  
2 federal grants, but we do that not directly to the  
3 private owner but through the state forester.

4 What is happening in the large forested  
5 states is the state department of forestry has  
6 developed an assessment and a general forest plan for  
7 the state including the private lands. You have to  
8 keep in mind though there's not complete control  
9 because you don't tell people what to do with their  
10 lands, they establish their own objectives, the state  
11 is mainly concerned about the abuse of lands and the  
12 continued or sustainable productivity of those lands  
13 and, to that extent, the courts have allowed the states  
14 to impose upon private rights to ensure that for the  
15 future these lands will remain productive. So that  
16 most states have now what they call their Forest  
17 Practices Act.

18 The Forest Practices Act was hammered out  
19 with boards or commissions of forestry made up of  
20 citizens providing the policy guidance to the state  
21 department of forestry and they prescribe such things  
22 as standards and guidelines and requirements in many  
23 cases for reforestation, for erosion control, water  
24 quality, for habitat maintenance, for fire protection,  
25 and in fact the states collect monies, sometimes it's

1 an assessment per acre or it's a severance tax on the  
2 timber itself to, you know, finance these kinds of  
3 activities. So the state forester has an organization  
4 in the field and often the private landowner is  
5 required to submit a forest harvest plan to the state,  
6 the state reviews that, consults with the private land  
7 owner, they negotiate the requirements to protect soil  
8 and water and fire and so forth, and then they inspect  
9 these areas.

10 Most states require that the cut-over  
11 areas be regenerated into a new forest within a  
12 specified period of time.

13 Now, that brings you right up to kind of  
14 the present. This controversy that has surrounded the  
15 Forest Service and the public land is also now moving  
16 onto private lands and we're experiencing things for  
17 the first time about how private land ought to be  
18 managed for other kinds of resources. So that as the  
19 Forest Service concerns itself about biodiversity or  
20 threatened and endangered species, about the cumulative  
21 effects of clearcutting, or the aesthetic values  
22 associated with forest lands and timber harvest, now  
23 the states are beginning to regulate this and the  
24 timber industry and the forest landowners are beginning  
25 to read these signals, in fact they're getting hit on

1 top of the head with them and they are being brought to  
2 court and there are protests and all the other things  
3 that people have ways of doing to change or alter  
4 activities.

5 The timber industry itself in the face of  
6 that are offering reforms and in my State of Oregon and  
7 in California and Washington there are major movements  
8 and initiatives by the timber industry itself to reduce  
9 the size of clearcuts, for example, or to accelerate  
10 the reforestation of privately logged areas. These are  
11 unprecedented.

12 I think by and large the industry has  
13 been good stewards of our forest lands but the public  
14 judges them differently and sees different values that  
15 are different than the objectives that the shareholders  
16 might have for Weyerhaeuser lands, so that now in my  
17 State of Oregon, for example, they're offering a  
18 clearcut limitation size, size limitation I believe  
19 it's 120 acres. This is considerably below what  
20 private industry traditionally has used for  
21 clearcutting.

22 The same thing has happened in  
23 California. A large timber, industrial timber  
24 landowner in California, Louisiana Pacific has  
25 announced that they will no longer clearcut period, no



1 clearcuts. And that, in my view, is a response to  
2 public sentiment in the United States against practices  
3 that, in their view, do not meet their aesthetic or  
4 wildlife or other resource objectives and goals.

5 So that is kind of where we are in the  
6 United States, I think in very much a period of  
7 transition and change, one in which the industry now is  
8 participating.

9 Q. Subject to any further questions --

10 MR. MARTEL: Can I ask a question. Yes.  
11 What type of -- you mentioned briefly there was some  
12 type of assistance but it can't be given directly to, I  
13 think you said, to the various companies.

14 THE WITNESS: Yes.

15 MR. MARTEL: What type of assistance in  
16 terms of regeneration or road construction go on on  
17 that massive private area?

18 THE WITNESS: Okay. There's a number of  
19 things that a private landowner has available to him or  
20 her. The Forest Service has what we call our state and  
21 private forestry program. The Forest Service, if you  
22 look at it, has a national forest system, that is one  
23 of our big jobs, forest research is another big job,  
24 and the third big job is state and private forestry  
25 which is kind of an extension service, if you can liken

1       it to agriculture, assisting in the technology, dollar  
2       assistance.

3               Now, the Forest Service does not deal  
4       directly with the customer in its state and private  
5       forestry program, it deals with the state entities that  
6       provide that to the customer. So the Forest Service  
7       would deal with the department of forestry in Oregon in  
8       providing assistance to private landowners. That  
9       assistance from the federal level generally is in terms  
10      of dollars for state staffing or providing a specialist  
11      in say manufacturing technology or reforestation  
12      technology, then the state then touches the customer,  
13      the private landowner.

14             If I were a private landowner and I want  
15      to do something with my forest and I'm not a forester I  
16      need help and assistance and in fact, because forestry  
17      is a very long-term affair, I need some -- maybe some  
18      assistance in investments, I can't afford to provide  
19      thinning or to provide reforestation for lands that  
20      perhaps I picked up that didn't have trees on it, so I  
21      would go to the state as one source and they would  
22      provide me assistance, they would send what they call a  
23      service forester to my property with me and we would  
24      walk over the property and talk about it, they might  
25      assist me in developing a forestry plan of activities

1 and eventual harvest or managing wildlife or improving  
2 water or providing access by helping me locate roads.

3 The state has limited resources to do  
4 that, so if it gets involved in a very detailed and  
5 very commercial type activity then there is a network  
6 of private consulting foresters in the United States,  
7 people who are foresters that make their living selling  
8 their services to private property owners.

9 Sometimes these people are under contract  
10 to small commercial operators. Somebody might own  
11 10,000 acres of forest land and want to put it under  
12 management and they would contract a consulting firm,  
13 becomes almost like their employee, and they have an  
14 understanding and they pay for this.

15 Others may say, you know, I've got 40  
16 acres on my property, I basically I just live there, I  
17 am a doctor or an attorney or I work in the sawmill but  
18 I want to manage these lands. They might go to a  
19 consultant on a very, you know, periodic basis look at  
20 it and say: Hey, what can I do here to improve the  
21 productivity of my forest lands over a period of time,  
22 and the consulting forester would come out and outline  
23 some thinnings or reforestation, maybe some pruning,  
24 that sort of thing and then 10 or 15 years later he  
25 might be asked to come back again and mark trees for

1 harvest, and the professional consulting forester would  
2 then assist the landowner in designating trees and  
3 probably developing a contract that has requirements  
4 that would protect his property when he tries to sell  
5 it to a logger or a sawmill or somebody that would  
6 utilize those materials.

7 So that is kind of the way it works.

8 MR. MARTEL: But is there direct  
9 assistance for example, let's say, to provide all of  
10 the seedlings at cost to, in this case the province,  
11 but in the States to the state to, someone private  
12 owner, let's say Weyerhaeuser - I think you mentioned  
13 one of the companies - could they draw on state  
14 assistance in any direct form to regenerate or to  
15 access certain areas as is done here?

16 THE WITNESS: I think the short answer to  
17 that is no. I can't tell you exactly what the criteria  
18 are to get dollar assistance, but a Weyerhaeuser, a  
19 Louisiana Pacific, those kind of people, you know,  
20 they're large industrial forests, they're not eligible  
21 for that kind of assistance.

22 A smaller landowner whose forest would be  
23 incidental could and there are out right grants, but  
24 more commonly there is cost sharing. So that if a  
25 property needs to be improved through reforestation, a

1 landowner might receive 50 per cent of the funds or in  
2 kind assistance, maybe he would be provided the  
3 seedlings provided he plants them, and that is  
4 primarily where that kind of assistance comes from and  
5 who receives it. Not the industrial foresters, they're  
6 in business, they have the capital, they have the money  
7 and that is built into their operating budgets.

8 MS. SWENARCHUK: You may not know on what  
9 controversial ground we may trod.

10 Madam Chair, did you wish to take the  
11 break at 10:20 or 10:30?

12 MADAM CHAIR: 10:20 is our normal time.

13 MS. SWENARCHUK: In that case, before we  
14 do so, I think we should give an exhibit number to that  
15 map which was provided in the interrogatories but I  
16 don't believe the Board has had it before.

17 MADAM CHAIR: No, we haven't. That will  
18 be Exhibit 1756.

19 MS. SWENARCHUK: Q. And could you  
20 describe for the Board what that map demonstrates, Mr.  
21 Smith?

22 A. A small scale map of the national  
23 forest system overlaying the map of the United States.

24 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1756: Small scale map of the national  
25 forest system overlaying a map  
of the United States.



1 MADAM CHAIR: We will be back in 20  
2 minutes.

3 ---Recess at 10:20 a.m.

4 ---On resuming at 10:40 a.m.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Please be seated.

6 Ms. Swenarchuk, we had some material here  
7 to make an exhibit. Do you want us to do it now or  
8 wait until the end of the day? Will it interrupt your  
9 flow right now?

10 MS. SWENARCHUK: Whatever you wish.

11 MADAM CHAIR: All right. There are two  
12 documents to be made exhibits today. The first is  
13 correspondence from a Mr. Greg Hlady who is identified  
14 as a policy advisor and member of People Interested in  
15 A Natural Environment and this documentation consists  
16 of a seven-page letter from Mr. Hlady to Premier Rae  
17 regarding community-based resources management, and the  
18 date on that letter is February the 13th, 1991, and we  
19 were included on the distribution list for that  
20 communication, and there is also a 13-page discussion  
21 paper concerning community-based resource management  
22 and we will give this material Exhibit No. 1757.

23 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1757: 20-page document from Greg Hlady,  
24 Policy Advisor and Member of  
25 People Interested in A Natural  
Environment consisting of 7-page  
letter from Mr. Hlady to Premier

1 Rae regarding community-based  
2 resource management and a 13-page  
3 dicussion paper concerning  
community-based resource  
management.

4 MADAM CHAIR: And the second document  
5 that will be made an exhibit is a response to an  
6 undertaking by the Ministry of Natural Resources and it  
7 is information given to Mr. James Gibb as a result of  
8 the Timmins community hearing, and it consists of a  
9 99-page document -- actually the 99-page document  
10 pertains to an undertaking with respect to the Sault  
11 Ste. Marie, Espanola and Timmins satellite hearings  
12 and, as well, there's a five-page document and map of  
13 Geikie Township and the latter is with respect to Mr.  
14 Gibb's questions at the Timmins satellite hearing.  
15 This information will be Exhibit 1758.

16 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1758: 99-page document from Ms.  
17 Blastorah re information in  
18 fulfillment of MNR undertakings  
19 given during EAB community  
20 hearings in Sault Ste. Marie,  
21 Espanola and Timmins, with 5-page  
22 document and forest stand map of  
Geikie Township showing Geikie  
Lake Road options and amendments  
from Ms. Blastorah re information  
in fulfillment of MNR undertaking  
given during EAB community  
hearing in Timmins.

23 MADAM CHAIR: And Mr. Pascoe will provide  
24 copies to the parties.

25 Thank you, Ms. Swenarchuk.

1 MS. SWENARCHUK: Madam Chair, while we're  
2 having this little digression then, I would like to  
3 introduce a topic that I was going to be introduce  
4 before we began this morning, and that is the question  
5 of FFT's intention with regard to the withdrawal of Dr.  
6 Legator's evidence.

7 I can inform the Board that I'm  
8 instructed that Forests for Tomorrow will not be  
9 requesting leave to lead evidence in substitution of  
10 Dr. Legator's evidence.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Swenarchuk.  
12 The Board will be I guess destroying the witness  
13 statements that you gave us--

14 MS. SWENARCHUK: It's withdrawn, yes.

15 MADAM CHAIR: --with respect to that and  
16 we will continue to refer to this panel as Panel 10.

17 MS. SWENARCHUK: For ease, yes.

18 MADAM CHAIR: All right, fine. Please go  
19 ahead.

20 MS. SWENARCHUK: Q. Now, before we turn  
21 to Mr. Smith's discussion of integrated planning and  
22 U.S. Forest Service planning process, I want to review  
23 very briefly the page of the witness statement in  
24 which, Mr. Smith, you talked about the history that led  
25 up to these changes.

1                   And, for example, on page 6 you have a  
2     heading which you then developed entitled: From  
3     Resource Surplus to Shortage, and I want to ask you in  
4     what period did this commission -- the shortage  
5     commission develop?

6                   A. Okay. As the nation grew and the  
7     national forest remained the same size, the demand  
8     availability relationship began to change too. The  
9     Forest Service through the World War II period, I think  
10    it could be said, was more custodial in nature, there  
11    was timber harvested and there were other activities  
12    going on but basically it was a matter of taking care  
13    of the resource for future use.

14                  Following the war there was a period of  
15    accelerated development and gradually people began to  
16    notice that development activities, including timber  
17    harvest and road buildings, was taking away from other  
18    kinds of values and, heretofore, when that occurred  
19    there was always plenty left over and I shall refer to  
20    that as the residual surplus left.

21                  In the 60s and 70s I believe it became  
22    very noticeable to the public, particularly in certain  
23    areas, that the national forests could not continue to  
24    provide all the developmental activities and still  
25    provide the amenities that people were looking for, so

1 a shortage began to occur, and it didn't occur just all  
2 at once or in the same place but gradually over time  
3 that became a very large issue.

4 So that I think it kind of culminated in  
5 the so-called Earth Day in 1970 in which people  
6 expressed very forcibly that there were values out  
7 there on these public lands and environments that were  
8 important and should be managed for instead of just  
9 whatever was left over.

10 Q. On page 7 of the witness statement  
11 you referred to emerging social values. Is it in that  
12 context then that you just referred to the Earth Day  
13 landmark?

14 A. Yes. I think these social values  
15 were always there and people were using them, but they  
16 didn't have to worry about them, they didn't have to  
17 set objectives and targets and insist that land be  
18 managed that way because there was always plenty left  
19 over, but that social awareness and the sort of  
20 quantification, if you will, by people that these are  
21 necessary objectives occurred when these shortages  
22 began to occur.

23 Q. And on page 9 of the witness  
24 statement in the third paragraph you've indicated that:

25 "As with any large organization, the



1 Forest Service lags behind the public  
2 sector."

3 Now, can you indicate in what way it  
4 lagged, what were the indications of that lag, and over  
5 what time period?

6 A. The indication of the lag was that  
7 during the 70s and 80s we continued a kind of business  
8 as usual. The Forest Service again is a very large  
9 organization, it is driven by budgets and targets  
10 established by the U.S. Congress and the  
11 administration, it was made up of people who had been  
12 doing things the same way for a long period of time and  
13 the public attitude got out in front of this, so that  
14 the Forest Service found itself satisfying public  
15 priorities and desires that were outdated and it  
16 manifested itself in controversies and conflicts,  
17 appeals, the Forest Service has an administrative  
18 appeal process and people began using it.

19 A good example. When I replaced the  
20 forest supervisor on the Sierra National Forest in  
21 California, he retired and he told me, he says: One  
22 thing I really like about my career, I never had an  
23 administrative appeal, and I immediately had about  
24 three or four. It was just a kind of a mark of the  
25 times, that people became dissatisfied and the Forest

1 Service had simply not been able to change rapidly  
2 enough.

3 Q. Now, how in your view should an  
4 organization with a mandate for management of public  
5 forest lands respond when public sentiment for change  
6 is identified?

7 A. Well, you know, first of all, you  
8 have to understand that the national forests belong to  
9 the people. There is a citizen owner out there who  
10 establishes what these lands will be used for and the  
11 Forest Service has to somehow keep track of that.

12 The Forest Service has no difficulty with  
13 the professional kinds of things; we have  
14 silviculturalists, we have landscape architects, we  
15 have biologists, we have, you know, the full array of  
16 those kinds of specialities but they don't necessarily  
17 know what the people want.

18 The people really have to establish what  
19 they want their lands used for, and then the Forest  
20 Service has to go about using all these resources and  
21 skills to accomplish that.

22 We know how to do it, there's no  
23 question -- I think there's little question about that,  
24 but the public has the role of establishing what the  
25 national forests are to be used for.

1                   So the agency has a responsibility of  
2     keeping track of that, and it's not an easy job to do  
3     of course because you get a lot of mixed signals from  
4     the public, but that I think is the response that the  
5     agency has to make, is to discover what the peoples'  
6     priorities are and then, you know, reflect those in the  
7     objectives and the targets and the policies of the  
8     agency so that that gets accomplished with the skills  
9     that they have.

10                  Q. On page 9 of the witness stamp you've  
11     written about changing the Forest Service mind set.  
12     Now, what in your view are the key elements that led to  
13     a change in the Forest Service mind set?

14                  A. Okay. First of all, the mind set  
15     was, you know, the tradition of doing business as we  
16     had. The Forest Service during the developmental  
17     period hired foresters and enginners primarily that  
18     were skilled and educated in how to harvest timber and  
19     build roads, and we did a very good job of that, I  
20     think, without abusing the resource, but the problem  
21     was that when the public changed its mind about what  
22     its priorities were or reflected them in a little  
23     different way, the Forest Service had a little trouble,  
24     kind of got whiplash you might say, couldn't really  
25     keep up with that, the mind set had already been

1 established.

2                   It was further reinforced by a Congress  
3 that was a little bit behind the curve too in that  
4 Congress kept giving us our money in terms of timber  
5 targets and development targets and dollars to go with  
6 that and the Forest Service does not have the  
7 discretion to move dollars around very much.

8                   If the chief goes to the Congress for an  
9 annual budget and they say: Here's your budget, you  
10 must produce 10-billion board feet of timber, that's  
11 what the Forest Service has to do, the Forest Service  
12 can't decide that: Well, that is not what the public  
13 wants today, so it will do something different.

14                   I describe that as kind of you are what  
15 you eat, and the Forest Service ate the budget and  
16 reflected that in a great number of production  
17 foresters, production enginners and dollar resources to  
18 accomplish those jobs.

19                   The public is over on this side  
20 dissatisfied that we aren't taking care of wildlife, we  
21 aren't taking care of aesthetics and biodiversity and  
22 recreation and the Forest Service was caught in this  
23 mind set of its own, plus, you know, the tools or the  
24 resources to accomplish the job the way the public  
25 wanted them.

1                   Q. So what led to the change then in the  
2 Forest Service mind set?

3                   A. I think it was the public controversy  
4 and the intensity of it, the public telling us what  
5 they wanted, what they didn't like that began to  
6 change.

7                   Also realize too that as new people came  
8 into the Forest Service they reflected a different  
9 perspective than people my age, for example, that had  
10 been there. I am a third generation Forest Service  
11 person, my grandfather, my father and myself developed  
12 a perception about what we should be doing and it was  
13 based on our own influences.

14                  I think another thing that assisted the  
15 change was that younger people were coming out of the  
16 universities with a different notion about what the  
17 national forests should be and how the natural  
18 resources ought to be managed. So that had an effect  
19 in changing it too.

20                  So the public telling us, new people  
21 coming in, and then a gradual change in the statutes  
22 that govern the Forest Service that began to, you know,  
23 move it a different direction.

24                  Q. I want to turn now to the subject of  
25 planning and your testimony to the Board about multiple



1 use.

2 First of all, you included on page 33 of  
3 your witness statement, and we now have in the  
4 overheads a corrected errata version - that is in  
5 Exhibit 1753, Madam Chair - a list of criteria,  
6 criteria produced by the Conservation Foundation found  
7 in its critique in our source book which we will refer  
8 to later.

9 I just want to refer first of all now to  
10 these criteria by which the Conservation Foundation  
11 judges planning. I would like you to read these into  
12 the record and indicate, Mr. Smith --

13 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me, Ms. Swenarchuk,  
14 are we on page 11 or page 33?

15 MS. SWENARCHUK: We are now on the last  
16 page of Exhibit 1753, the overheads.

17 Q. I would like you to review these  
18 criteria, Mr. Smith, read them into the record and  
19 indicate whether you agree with these criteria as a  
20 fundamental standard for measuring quality of the  
21 planning process?

22 A. The Forest Service, following the  
23 bulk of our planning process, contracted with the  
24 Conservation Foundation which is a non-profit sort of  
25 policy analysis non-governmental group in Washington DC

1 in concert with Purdue University to critique the  
2 planning process. It has taken us eight, nine years to  
3 do this.

4 It was a sort of a pioneering effort,  
5 certainly I don't think anywhere in the world we have  
6 had as complex and as long an effort in wildlife  
7 planning. It involved lots of Forest Service people,  
8 lots of other agency people and the public in a very  
9 large sense.

10 The Forest Service contracted for a  
11 critique. The Conservation Foundation is a fairly  
12 respectable, respected group in Washington, Purdue  
13 University is judged to be fairly objective. In the  
14 process of doing this they went to a lot of places in  
15 the United States, talked to a lot of people, both  
16 Forest Service and citizens and they came up with some  
17 criteria that they suggested would be useful in judging  
18 planning, whether it was successful, whether it was  
19 working, and these several points are made in their  
20 report and on the overhead.

21 First of all, the process is simple and  
22 clear. You can say that that is a good criterion. I  
23 don't think anybody can say that the Forest Service  
24 process was all that simple. It is not all that clear  
25 neither to the public nor to Forest Service people. I

1 think on balance, as the Conservation Foundation said,  
2 the planning process worked and it produced reasonably  
3 good products, however, it could be improved by making  
4 it more simple and clear so that people could  
5 understand it, even Forest Service people had a hard  
6 time understanding it.

7 The second point is that the process is  
8 transparent. What that means is it's easy to see what  
9 you're trying to accomplish, it's apparent to anybody  
10 trying to watch or oversee the agency or look over your  
11 shoulder what you're trying to accomplish, it isn't  
12 obscured by a lot of process and computers and numbers  
13 and technical things. Transparent with the public  
14 involved throughout.

15 And we want to remember that the agency  
16 knows how to do a lot of things, has a lot of skill in  
17 that respect, but the public is the body who determines  
18 what the public lands is to be used for, what are the  
19 purposes. So the public needs to be involved  
20 throughout that process in setting objectives and  
21 purposes, sharing in information, developing  
22 alternatives, evaluating those alternatives and  
23 actually making the selection of the plan.

24 MR. MARTEL: Could I ask you a question  
25 before you go any further?

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 MR. MARTEL: How much then does the  
3 public in the United States, even in the land under the  
4 Forest Service, have from square one in even  
5 establishing -- for example, do they have a say in how  
6 much will be cut or is the material put together for  
7 them first and then they make a decision on how that  
8 best can be achieved, or are they even in on the quotas  
9 and the amount that will be harvested and so on?

10 Now, how heavily involved --

11 MS. SWENARCHUK: If I can just interject  
12 here. We plan to have Mr. Smith review the public  
13 consultation process in a fair amount of detail using  
14 the Willamette plan as an example.

15 Q. Perhaps you could just respond  
16 briefly to Mr. Martel now, if that is satisfactory to  
17 you?

18 MR. MARTEL: Yes.

19 THE WITNESS: Two things I would like to  
20 say about that. One is, you have a history, sort of a  
21 general acceptance and endorsement by the public in the  
22 early days of the country developing, it was okay to  
23 use natural resources to develop the country, so a  
24 little bit of that occurred on national forests and  
25 then as it grew people began to be concerned about the

1 balance of development versus other kinds of uses, then  
2 they began to immerse themselves to a greater degree,  
3 primarily through the Congress, their elected  
4 representatives, in helping to establish, you know,  
5 targets and balances and investments and so forth, and  
6 then finally in this planning process they became  
7 intimately involved in arguing about what the targets  
8 ought to be or what ought to happen on these lands,  
9 national forest by national forest.

10 So it's sort have been an evolutionary  
11 thing, where there's sort of a little complacency and  
12 acceptance to a representative form of government  
13 attempting to establish those, and then finally the  
14 people jumping in feet first and saying: Hey, wait a  
15 minute, you know, I don't like what you're doing.

16 And, of course, you have the whole range  
17 of perception on that. Some people wanted more, some  
18 people wanted nothing. But as Michele says, we are  
19 going to talk about how that was kind of facilitated  
20 and finally what kind of happened as a result of it.  
21 So the key point here is that you've got a process that  
22 is understandable and the public can interface with it  
23 and is in fact involved throughout.

24 The third point is that the plan needs to  
25 be based on sound current information. In a very large



1 land base it's difficult to have detailed information.  
2 It's still embarrassing to me to not sometimes know  
3 what is out there on the national forest. I'm sure  
4 it's the case in Ontario as well. It's such a great  
5 vast area that you can't know every detail. Somebody  
6 probably knows if you're look at the entire population,  
7 but the agency doesn't know everything.

8 So the plan has to be based on an  
9 inventory of information and data that will allow you  
10 to, No. 1, determine what the land is capable of doing  
11 within its productivity, its biological and physical  
12 capacities and then, secondly, match that up with what  
13 the land's response is to various kinds of public  
14 desires and priorities. So information needs to be  
15 available and has to be accurate and enough of it so  
16 that you can make some decisions.

17 The next point is that the process is not  
18 an ordeal. The Forest Service planning process was an  
19 ordeal, there's no question about it. I have likened  
20 it to trying to assemble a bicycle while you're riding  
21 it, it's very very difficult. We got bogged down in a  
22 process that was developed by a committee of  
23 scientists. You can imagine a bunch of university  
24 professors coming together to design a process and then  
25 trying to do it on the grounds of ordinary people. It

1 was complex, it drug out over a long period of time,  
2 people had a hard time understanding it, we had to come  
3 back and we kept revising things, we kept adding  
4 direction to it and so on.

5 The Conservation Foundation saying, you  
6 know, a good plan is not an ordeal, people ought to  
7 enjoy and should it and it should take a reasonable  
8 amount of time and end up with a product.

9 The next feature is the plan results in a  
10 vision of future management that can be clearly  
11 understood. It's not enough to lay a big stack of  
12 computer runs out of a linear program that establishes  
13 net present value and all those kinds of things and lay  
14 it out and say: Now, here's your plan, what do you  
15 think about it? You've really got to develop a vision,  
16 sort of a description of the desired condition. If I  
17 do this, what is this forest going to look like, what  
18 does it mean to me, and that is really what it boils  
19 down to.

20 When I was a regional forester I was the  
21 deciding officer on 18 national forest plans and as  
22 they came to me with these 15 pounds in this draft form  
23 really what I tried do is cut right through that and  
24 just ask the forest supervisor, you know, describe to  
25 me what your forest is going to look like. If you're

1       implement this plan, 10 years from now if I walk out  
2       there what am I going to see, what's going to be  
3       happening, what kind of products are we going to be  
4       providing.

5                   And if that can be done, and I think  
6       people are more likely to be able to say: Yes, I like  
7       that or, no, I don't like it, I would rather have  
8       something like this, then you can deal with it.

9                   The last point is the process addresses  
10      major issues in terms people can understand, and I sort  
11      of talked about that in the previous point. We get  
12      bogged down in a lot of bureaucratic language that  
13      perhaps means something to a forester or an engineer  
14      but eventually it's got to boil down to issues and  
15      terminology that the citizen owner can relate to.

16                   Our planning has been issue oriented.  
17      One issue is how much wilderness did we have. That is  
18      a fairly straightforward question, and if you have this  
19      much what does it mean. It means you give up this or  
20      you give up that, whatever it might be. How much  
21      timber should we harvest, should we harvest it with  
22      clearcutting or not clearcutting.

23                   Those are the kind of issues that ought  
24      to be the focus of the planning effort so when you end  
25      up you have, you know, resolved those issues one way or

1 another. That's not to mean everybody is going to be  
2 happy with it, but perhaps there's a near consensus  
3 about it, yes, given all the issues and all the  
4 ramifications, that is where we want to be.

5 Those are the several points that the  
6 Conservation Foundation judged to be the way to value a  
7 plan and I agree with those.

8 If I were talking to a group of  
9 professional planners they would probably have other  
10 ways of explaining this, but this is geared towards the  
11 people that own these national forests and how they  
12 would would want it to be.

13 MS. SWENARCHUK: Q. I want to turn now  
14 to the discussion of multiple use, past and future, in  
15 your witness statement. And we see at page 10 of the  
16 witness statement in the second part of the first  
17 paragraph that:

18 "The application of multiple use and  
19 integrated planning has evolved over the  
20 past two decades. It continues to do so  
21 as the Forest Service attempts to  
22 implement its latest series of land and  
23 resource plans. We are in a period of  
24 transition but definitely moving to full  
25 integrated resource use in accordance

1                   with the peoples' will."

2                   And then on the next page you provide a  
3       schematic look at past and future approaches. This has  
4       been produced as an overhead corrected in Exhibit 1753  
5       and I would like you to go ahead now and explain the  
6       concept and developments that are summarized in that  
7       chart there?

8                   A. As I said in my witness statement,  
9       our application of the multiple use has sort of evolved  
10      through the years. I had an incident that occurred  
11      about three or four years ago. We had a hundred  
12      Bavarian foresters touring the western United States  
13      and I had them in northern California, we were  
14      observing "multiple use" activities on the national  
15      forests in northern California.

16                  We were standing there looking at some  
17      clearcuts and Dick Plochmann who was then the chair of  
18      the Forestry School at the University of Munich and the  
19      leader of the group -- I said: Now, this is multiple  
20      use in action. And he said: This is not multiple  
21      use", he says, "This is single use applied to specific  
22      areas.

23                  And as you think about it, it was,  
24      because we were looking at a clearcut, that although it  
25      wasn't all that large, probably 40 acres or so, was



1 completely cut, everything burned on it, replanted, and  
2 sprayed, so that there was nothing but, you know, 640  
3 Douglas-fir seedlings growing in this 40-acre plot and  
4 then about two 40-acre plots to the side on the same  
5 road would be another one of these.

6 And his point was that, you know, our  
7 application of multiple use more resembled a collection  
8 of single uses, it wasn't applied to the land in  
9 general. Now, we talk about ecosystem approach or the  
10 protection of biodiversity, and I think we are  
11 somewhere in the transition of getting to what Dick  
12 Plochmann was talking about. We're not quite there and  
13 that is why this chart, I tried to select some key  
14 words that describe where we have been and where we're  
15 going, and I guess it's kind of like the story if you  
16 don't change your ways you're going to end up where  
17 you're headed, and what we want to do is make sure that  
18 we alter our practices so that we end up in a desired  
19 future.

20 So this is divided into past and the  
21 future, realizing we're somewhere inbetween. We are  
22 making faster progress in some places and slower  
23 progress in others. And then I have a number of little  
24 subheadings down each one and they are juxtaposed on  
25 each other.

1                   So that beginning with the first one, the  
2 past, I think represented a dominant use approach or a  
3 functional use approach. We did our planning and our  
4 development with the idea to develop grazing or mining  
5 or timber and we kind of managed it that way and we  
6 implemented it that way, we just kind of dedicated a  
7 piece of national forest ground and we raised trees on  
8 it and we cut them down. So there's a broad category  
9 of dominant use approach versus, in the future, an  
10 ecosystem approach.

11                   And some of the key words that describe  
12 that subheading is, on the dominant use approach side,  
13 is sort of extractive market-oriented like energy  
14 development or timber harvest or animal unit months  
15 cows and goats or whatever, grazing grass.

16                   On the other side, the future side, it's  
17 a mix of market and non-market, non-market being  
18 wildernesses or land biodiversity or wildlife, things  
19 that you normally don't trade for dollars in the  
20 marketplace, aesthetics, solitude and clean water.  
21 There are ways you can put dollar values on those  
22 things, but generally they are thought of as being kind  
23 of non-market.

24                   So dominant use is more extractive, what  
25 can you get out of this forest, you can get so much

1 iron ore or so much oil or so many board feet of  
2 timber; the other side is doing those things but also  
3 accounting for the non-market values.

4 The next would be single use allocation  
5 vis-a-vis multiple use allocation. Here again, like  
6 Dick Plochmann said, what he observed we call multiple  
7 use is really a bunch of single use allocations. We  
8 had a clearcut here and then we had a blank space that  
9 had all these other things that nobody seemed to be  
10 managing particularly but it was there, eventually  
11 they'd be cut very often, versus a multiple use  
12 allocation where you really look at that ground and  
13 say, you know, there's a number of values and uses  
14 associated with that, as we remove timber we want to do  
15 it in such a way to protect, perpetuate, to sustain all  
16 of the other values.

17 On the past side there's more or less of  
18 a resource focus, you plan and you practice multiple  
19 use, you think about timber or you think about  
20 recreation or you think about wildlife, and your mind  
21 set begins to think about those things from a sort of a  
22 maximization point of view.

23 Where on the other side you look at more  
24 of a landscape focus. Landscape is a term that some of  
25 the planners and the university people are now using to

1 describe, you know, a broader look at all of the values  
2 that would be associated with an ecosystem or a forest  
3 area. None of these are all inclusive, you know,  
4 there's a lot of colour inbetween them, but it's  
5 just -- it's a way of kind of describing with a word or  
6 two where we want to be, where we want to be in the  
7 future and where we've been in the past.

8 Okay. The next subheading has to do with  
9 residual and surplus versus shortage and tradeoffs,  
10 it's just where we've been.

11 In the past we had a lot of excess  
12 capacity, the national forests were very big, the  
13 country didn't have very many people, there wasn't that  
14 much demand on it, so there was always a residual, a  
15 little surplus left.

16 If the Forest Service made a timber sale  
17 in my favorite fishing drainage it's okay because the  
18 one right next door is the same, just as good, I can  
19 just go up that one. But then we entered into a period  
20 of time when there was a shortage and there had to be  
21 tradeoffs. So that when the Forest Service got through  
22 logging every one of these drainages I didn't have any  
23 place to go for my natural fishing. It meant that  
24 there was a shortage, and it meant there was going to  
25 have to be some decisions made about balance, and I use

1 the term tradeoffs in that case.

2 Okay. The next subheading describes the  
3 past, I think, as an extensive application. Some of  
4 these terms by the way may seem incongruant to you but  
5 you have to take them into context. In other words,  
6 extensive application you might say sounds like  
7 landscape. Well it's a little different context and  
8 let me try to bring that out.

9 It's extensive application versus a kind  
10 of reduced scale application. What I mean here is a  
11 lot of our plans we have vast areas that in the past  
12 that said these areas are available for kind of general  
13 forest purposes; i.e., timber harvest probably on most  
14 of the national forests then and it got a sort of  
15 uniform treatment. And we designated this large area  
16 for general forest purposes and then we turned out our  
17 district rangers and their operational crews to lay out  
18 the timber harvest plans and they just rolled over the  
19 whole thing. Well, this is a general forest area so,  
20 therefore, we will just clearcut or we will do whatever  
21 we do.

22 And what happened is that they failed to  
23 recognize some of these other values, these special  
24 places that I place, you know, opposite under the  
25 reduced scale application.



1 I think the Forest Service as much as  
2 anything failed to have a sense of place in applying  
3 multiple use. We would say this vast area is general  
4 forest, therefore, we can clearcut, burn and replant  
5 and spray it, but in the meantime we clearcut, burnt  
6 and plant and spray old unique groves and old growth  
7 forest, unusual communities of plants, we rolled over  
8 elk calving grounds, you know, all of those kind of  
9 things just kind of got lost in that shuffle because it  
10 had already been allocated to general forest use.

11 Another descriptor under that would be  
12 conflict, area of conflict as opposed to accommodation.  
13 In the past I think conflict has been, you know, sort  
14 of a major thing that we sort of accepted. You have a  
15 conflict you just give up something.

16 In the future I think that we recognize  
17 that if there is going to be a conflict we try to  
18 accommodate the alternative values. Instead of  
19 sacrificing an area for the sake of timber harvest or  
20 ski area development we try to conduct that activity in  
21 such a way that it accommodates a sense of visual  
22 resource or accommodates the need for a deer migration  
23 route or the habitat for spotted owl or, you know,  
24 whatever it might be.

25 The last thing there under that

1 subcategory is mitigation versus enhancement, and  
2 perhaps there will be a time to talk more about the  
3 approach to multiple use, mitigation versus  
4 enhancement.

5 I think most Forest Service people in  
6 implementing an integrated plan such as you have there,  
7 before you begin with, say, timber harvest and they say  
8 how can we mitigate all the impacts to the visual  
9 resource, to recreation, to wildlife habitat to  
10 diversity. And, of course, mitigation is something you  
11 have to consider somewhere along the line. Well, I'm  
12 saying: Well, the first thing you do is think about  
13 enhancing it.

14 I can give you a quick example. If we're  
15 going to harvest timber in a particular spot in a  
16 national forest and you need to have a road to access  
17 that, you could think about: Well, we will put the  
18 road from point A to point B, we will make the most  
19 cost effective road, the easiest in terms of timber  
20 sale logging removals, and then we will try to, you  
21 know, mitigate any problems it gives to anadromous  
22 fish. Where the road crosses the stream we will put a  
23 big enough culvert in or we will bridge it or we will  
24 do something to accommodate that.

25 And that works reasonably well, but a

1 better way to do it is to begin with enhancement, say:  
2 Okay, we have got a multitude of resource values here,  
3 we need to have a road to access this timber, how can  
4 that road, instead of just mitigating these problems,  
5 how can it actually enhance these other values.

6 And one might think of recreation in that  
7 respect. There might be an important vista or an  
8 important recreation feature that the road could either  
9 avoid and wreck it or the road could provide access to  
10 it that would enhance the public's use and enjoyment of  
11 that particular recreation feature.

12 Beginning with enhancement, I think,  
13 results in people ending up with a little different  
14 project design than if they begin with mitigation.  
15 It's a subtle difference but I have observed it  
16 throughout my career that when people use one or the  
17 other starting point they end up at a different place.

18 Now, both are necessary. This is kind of  
19 where you start, you don't start by saying, you know,  
20 timber harvest is going to impact everything, how do we  
21 minimize the impacts, it's better to start over here  
22 and say, timber harvest is going to occur, how can we  
23 design that timber harvest program in such a way that  
24 it enhances some of these other values and very often  
25 you find some important things that if you think about

1 the future and other resource values that is where  
2 you'll end up.

3 Okay. Another way to describe past and  
4 future is that in the past we have kind of concentrated  
5 on how to do things, the scientific and economic  
6 factors, sort of the rationale manager point of view  
7 generally figured out and let the public review it.

8 I'm saying we need to move in the future  
9 to ask ourselves first the question of what are we  
10 trying to accomplish here, what are these lands for,  
11 what does this project lead us to, and that is going to  
12 deal with both the scientific and social/political  
13 elements. And, you know, every resource issue --  
14 natural resource issue has two sides, a science side  
15 and a social/political side and both are important.

16 Instead of just the rationale manager,  
17 you know, management by objectives sort of point of  
18 view and targets and so forth, begin thinking more  
19 about values. What are the values of people.  
20 Hopefully people are discovering their own values about  
21 natural resources and they don't always equate to  
22 dollars and cents and other kinds of things that are  
23 traditionally quantified.

24 And the public review it versus public  
25 involvement. Review is one thing, that means the

1 Forest Service designs everything and lays it out  
2 before the public and gets some comments on it. The  
3 other is, maybe the public ought to be involved in  
4 designing the thing to begin with.

5 And we have some experience in how this  
6 works. Our failures seem to, you know, fall on the  
7 side of having the public review things after we have  
8 already decided them versus having the public  
9 participate in establishing what we're going to do and  
10 how we're going to do it. So there's another way to  
11 describe, you know, where we've been and where we've  
12 got to be headed.

13 The other is functional versus integrated  
14 and we will talking a lot more about that, I suppose,  
15 but I think a lot of our activity was really  
16 multidisciplinary rather than interdisciplinary and  
17 there's perhaps a subtle difference between the two.

18 On the functional side in the  
19 multidisciplinary side the district ranger or forest  
20 supervisor might have a number of disciplines like a  
21 wildlife biologist, a soil scientist, a forester, a  
22 landscape architect advising him on some project or a  
23 decision, all of that advice would come to the district  
24 ranger or the decision-maker and then he would decide.  
25 And that is one way to do it, and that is the way we



1 have done it primarily in the past whether it was a  
2 planning effort, designing a project, or making a  
3 decision.

4 The way I'm suggesting we need to do it  
5 is interdisciplinary, and that is where perhaps the  
6 same resource specialists are involved but they sit  
7 around at a table and they hammer it out. The  
8 decision-maker has handed them maybe an integrated  
9 resource plan that establishes some purposes and now  
10 they've got to decide how to harvest that timber or how  
11 to develop that ski area or provide recreation or  
12 improve habitat for salmon or whatever.

13 There's a lot of difference between a  
14 group sitting around the table like that and arriving  
15 at some consensus about how something ought to be done  
16 and then giving it to the decision-maker versus each  
17 one coming into the decision-maker's office, knocking  
18 on the door and says here's my advice, because it  
19 leaves the integration of that to one individual  
20 instead of getting the heads together around the table  
21 and hammering it out. There's a lot of difference in  
22 the outcome.

23 The other thing that described functional  
24 versus integrated has to do with the budgets, the way  
25 we measure things and establish objectives for

1 ourselves, budgets, targets versus vision and desired  
2 state.

3 If you're working with 32,000 people I  
4 think it's a lot better for them to share a vision of  
5 where we want to be, a desired condition, rather than  
6 just solely looking at targets and budgets. And I'm  
7 not saying discard of budgets and targets, we need  
8 those for accountability, but it's got to be more than  
9 that, because we're making thousands and thousands of  
10 little decisions every day, and lots of people are, the  
11 trail crew foreman, the biologist, the forest  
12 supervisor, the chief, you know, the landscape  
13 architect, whoever it might be the, budgets officer, we  
14 make these little decisions that you can't prescribe in  
15 the directive system, there's no recipe for it, it  
16 doesn't tell you anything in the budgets and targets  
17 that what you want is this mass of 32,000 people, you  
18 know, generally moving west towards a vision of  
19 something.

20 And as I make my little individual  
21 decision that day about my work, then I'll be turning  
22 in the right direction each time instead of off in  
23 different directions, and it's kind of a principle of  
24 large organization management and I think it gets to  
25 the core of the issue of what the lands ought to be

1 managed for.

2 The quantitative versus qualitative.

3 Again, you have to have both, but I think in the past  
4 we were concerned mostly with quantitative dollars and  
5 cents, board feet, animal unit months, tonnes of ore,  
6 you know, units of gas and oil or whatever it might be,  
7 and I'm saying now we've got to add to that a  
8 qualitative development. Some things simply can't be  
9 quantified in dollars or cents, you know, widgets  
10 produced, it's got to be qualitative.

11 And lastly a descriptor of functional  
12 certainly for us has been that it has been confrontive  
13 and we want to move towards consensus. That relates a  
14 good deal to the way you interface with your public  
15 the, citizen owner of these public lands.

16 Okay. Now, another subdivision is  
17 boundaries versus coordination. In the United States,  
18 and perhaps this is not as big an issue in Ontario, we  
19 have various jurisdictions, you know, the land and the  
20 resource doesn't care about jurisdictions.

21 If you're looking at biodiversity or  
22 ecosystem, keeping it whole, it doesn't care whether  
23 the the Bureau of Land Management is responsible or the  
24 Forest Service or the Parks Service or Weyerhaeuser, it  
25 is altogether, and rather than just bang right up

1       against the boundaries we ought to be crossing  
2       boundaries with coordination.

3               It boils down to simple things like being  
4       a good neighbour. On the national forest we don't  
5       clearcut right up against a national park, you know,  
6       you wouldn't want your neighbour to deposit his garbage  
7       right on your boundary, we don't want the county or a  
8       local government to have a landfill -- a sanitary  
9       landfill right against the national forest where we  
10      have a campground. It's kind of like being a good  
11      neighbour, the good neighbour policy is a good one to  
12      adopt.

13             So I think in the past we have tended to  
14      look at those boundaries as an absolute, we will  
15      clearcut right up against our wilderness, and in the  
16      future here we're saying: Hey, you know, there needs  
17      to be a transition to those kind of things, we don't  
18      clearcut right up to our wilderness. Sometimes we  
19      clearcut wilderness because we don't know where the  
20      boundary is, but that's not on purpose. Okay.

21             Q. You're not alone.

22             A. The next subheading is the discrete  
23      actions versus cumulative effects. I think in the past  
24      we had a tendency of taking timber as our major  
25      activity as far as development goes. We would plan a

1 timber sale, a timber harvest and we would design it.  
2 I think we designed it well, it was professional, and  
3 we would do that job and we would move on to the next  
4 one.

5 The problem was that we weren't measuring  
6 or anticipating the cumulative effects of that timber  
7 sale or timber harvest and this timber harvest and this  
8 one looking down the line for about 10 years, we  
9 just -- you know, it just never came to us to do that.  
10 You know, it's not easy to do here, but now I think in  
11 the future we must think about that. How much  
12 harvested area should you have in one basic drainage at  
13 any one time. What effect does it have on wildlife.

14 You know, some species of wildlife thrive  
15 on clearcuts because of the species that come in  
16 afterwards. What if you clearcut 30 per cent of the  
17 drainage and the population of the deer goes way up and  
18 then as that canopy closes over and those species  
19 disappear then the population crashes, so you're going  
20 from feast to famine. That is just an example of why I  
21 think we have got to concern ourselves with cumulative  
22 effects.

23 Water qualities and stream sedimentation  
24 is another issue. We can design a timber sale that is  
25 completely acceptable from the standpoint of sediment



1 into streams but what about adding the next timber sale  
2 and the next timber sale. Now, you're talking about  
3 stream sedimentation that is unacceptable, or maybe  
4 it's water temperature where you're cutting in a  
5 drainage and one unit of timber harvest is not going to  
6 materially affect the temperature of water. You know  
7 some species of fish are very sensitive to temperature,  
8 and if you begin to have too much water in a drainage  
9 that is exposed to radiation, the sun and so forth, you  
10 may end up with moving the habitat line for fish 10  
11 miles up the stream, and we have had cases where that  
12 has happened. So cumulative effects is important not  
13 just looking at individual actions.

14 The other thing that can be said about  
15 where we've been in the past is we have developed a  
16 great deal of polarization. It's either this or that,  
17 it's either black or white. People zap to extreme  
18 positions. Where we want to be is in a mode of  
19 consensus where we're looking at options and there's a  
20 variety of things and there's coordination and  
21 involvement. We're certainly not there yet, we have a  
22 lot of polarization in the U.S., a lot of conflict that  
23 is not resulting in consensus, but that is where we  
24 want to be. We have got to figure out some ways to do  
25 that.

1                   Getting down towards the end of the chart  
2       here, dispersion versus landscape. In dispersion we  
3       felt taking timber harvest as an example, that as long  
4       as we kind of distributed clearcuts in a reasonable  
5       fashion that that was probably okay. So we had a  
6       40-acre block cut and a 40-acre block left uncut and on  
7       and on. In fact we have some places where we have a  
8       ridge line road in our steep country where we are cable  
9       logging up to the road, this is steep country, and it  
10      looks like diapers hanging on a clothes line. You get  
11      off and take a picture of it you see all these little  
12      squares on this road that hang below the road. It  
13      looks like diapers hanging on a clothes line.

14                   And that at one time was felt to be okay  
15      because it was called dispersion, but what it did it  
16      was fragmenting the whole ecosystem to the point where  
17      nothing was left that was of any size that would allow  
18      the ecosystem to function in a more natural process.  
19      That is not to say we want everything to be natural,  
20      not at all, but I think we final acknowledge and  
21      admitted that natural processes aren't bad and to the  
22      degree that we can preserve those natural processes  
23      most foresters agree with that now.

24                   Okay. The flip side of that is the  
25      landscape approach in which I'm going to use a couple

1 of terms, biodiversity, new forestry. Biodiversity is  
2 just acknowledging that everything is kind of connected  
3 in these ecosystems and we ought to retain as much of  
4 that connectiveness as possible. We should in  
5 development, whether it be timber harvest or whatever,  
6 you know, leave enough legacy for that ecosystem and  
7 its biodiversity to recover, restore itself and to  
8 function.

9 New forestry is a U.S. term that you may  
10 not use in this country. It is an application of  
11 forestry techniques in such a way that you preserve as  
12 much biodiversity or legacy for biodiversity as  
13 possible, and we will probably talk more about that.

14 It has application when you have certain  
15 objectives and the actual practice or the techniques of  
16 new forestry will vary from, you know, forest type to  
17 forest type. The principle and the concept is what I  
18 am emphasizing.

19 Lastly, you know, the summary is business  
20 as usual or change. In all my futuring activities, you  
21 know, I have been convinced that the only thing you can  
22 be certain of is it's going to change, and if we don't  
23 change we're going to, you know, be replaced by  
24 somebody who will run the national forest that will  
25 change. So the past is business as usual. We all tend

1 to want to stick to that, it's more comfortable. The  
2 future is, adaptive change will allow the national  
3 forests to better respond to what has changed in the  
4 public's mind or view or interest in those forests.  
5 That is probably more than you ever wanted to know  
6 about it too.

7 MS. SWENARCHUK: Thank you.

8 Q. Now, Mr. Smith, turning to page 12 of  
9 your witness statement and moving on with the concept  
10 of multidisciplinary planning versus interdisciplinary,  
11 you have said starting in the fourth line of page 12  
12 that:

13 "Truly interdisciplinary plans, if  
14 implemented by multidisciplinary project  
15 design teams, tend to lose their  
16 integration when they finally hit the  
17 ground."

18 And could you explain what you mean by  
19 that and how that happens?

20 A. What I'm talking about now is  
21 implementing a land plan or a forest plan. Assuming  
22 that that forest plan does reflect an integrated  
23 planning approach, and I think this Willamette plan is  
24 not perfect by any means but it's the first generation  
25 of that kind of thing, the problem I see is that once

1 this plan is handed to the district ranger, the  
2 operational people on the ground and they see that it  
3 contains a timber target and they go out and they plan  
4 and design timber harvest areas, that they fall back  
5 into a multidisciplinary mode approach, if you will,  
6 rather than continue the interdisciplinary approach  
7 that was taken in the plan.

8 Again, it may sound like a subtle  
9 difference to you, but it's been my experience that you  
10 come out with totally different results. So that what  
11 we would like to see is the district ranger's  
12 silviculturalist, wildlife biologist, landscape  
13 architect, recreation specialist, ecologist, whoever,  
14 when they sit down to fulfill the timber production  
15 targets that are outlined in this integrated plan that  
16 they work together, all those people come together,  
17 they sit around a table and talk about it, establish  
18 what they're trying to accomplish, they go out in the  
19 field, they walk the area, they talk about it, and  
20 rather than the timber people simply going out and  
21 saying: This stand of timber is of an age and a  
22 condition that it should be cut and clearcutting  
23 appears to respond to reforestation needs and to  
24 economic needs, they have all of these folks involved.

25 And they may find that that is not quite



1 the way they will do it because there are other values  
2 involved, other biodiversity or recreation  
3 opportunities or sustainability, all those things that  
4 are considered as a part of an interdisciplinary  
5 activity, rather than the timber people, you know,  
6 planning the sale and then the fisheries biologist  
7 coming in and says: Oh, that is going to wreck this  
8 thing or this or that and then they try to mitigate it  
9 a bit. You end up in a different place when you  
10 finally come out with the design plan.

11 And the district ranger may attempt -- he  
12 or she may attempt to, you know, integrate this in his  
13 own mind but it's a lot easier for the wildlife  
14 biologist to deal with the silviculturalist and the  
15 silviculturalist says: Oh, I know how to solve that, I  
16 mean silviculturally we can do this and it solves this  
17 biologist's problem, and that goes on a repeated number  
18 of times.

19 It's hard work and the Forest Service  
20 doesn't have a whole lot of experience in it because  
21 we've done it - like we've done it in the past - but we  
22 have got to move to that, and I think it's critical if  
23 we're really going to end up with the desired condition  
24 that this plan suggests, otherwise we will have a bunch  
25 of kind of single uses, we will have a collection of

1 single uses that doesn't really optimize all of the  
2 values for those properties.

3 MR. MARTEL: If you're going to have --  
4 you're saying that we need staff right out there  
5 together as we proceed after the plan is drafted.  
6 Otherwise you just fall back into old habits.

7 I think the evidence we have had - and I  
8 use the word think because the lawyers usually jump  
9 when I'm not as precise as they like me to be, even  
10 though you're just talking about generalities - then  
11 just sending out a forester and a technician, I think  
12 that is what happens, the biologist comes around some  
13 time but he's not there constantly, part of the  
14 budgeting I suppose is some of the difficulty.

15 How do you overcome that? I mean, what's  
16 your staff ratio? We've heard from the foresters  
17 saying: Well, they've got far too expansive an area to  
18 deal with, one forester for half a million hectares or  
19 something like that, or acres.

20 And so how do you arrange the staffing so  
21 that you have everybody that is needed out there at the  
22 time they're required as opposed to just somebody out  
23 there checking occasionally?

24 I'm not sure you if you get the drift of  
25 what I am --

1                   THE WITNESS: No, I think you've made it  
2 perfectly clear. I think that is a problem with the  
3 Forest Service too. Perhaps it's not as intense a  
4 problem in the United States as it is in Ontario,  
5 although I think we have had that kind of experience in  
6 the past and we still have places where that is I think  
7 still the case.

8                   We managed the 77.3-million hectares with  
9 about 32,000 people, permanent people, and then there's  
10 another 20, 25, 28,000 seasonal people. Now, I don't  
11 know how that compares to Ontario, that may tell the  
12 whole story of what is possible with staffing.

13                  We try to have the full range of  
14 disciplines either on a ranger district or available to  
15 that district ranger at the forest level, so if a  
16 ranger does not have an archaeologist - and most of  
17 them don't - an archaeologist would be available to  
18 that ranger from the forest staff. I believe it's safe  
19 to say that every national forest has an archaeologist  
20 or someone who is skilled in cultural, in  
21 archaeological resources.

22                  Every ranger that has a timber program is  
23 going to have a silviculturalist, will I think in every  
24 case now have a biologist of some sort that deals with  
25 wildlife or fisheries, sometimes both, a specialist in

1 fisheries and a specialist in wildlife, every district  
2 ranger will have an engineer, civil engineer to deal  
3 with the access and facilities issues, most district  
4 rangers have a landscape architect that can deal with  
5 the visual resource, most rangers have either a soil  
6 scientist or a watershed management specialist and, in  
7 every case, a ranger who is confronted with that kind  
8 of a project will either have them on his or her  
9 immediate staff or immediately accessible on the forest  
10 staff and they are simply scheduled.

11 Now, easier said than done. You know, as  
12 I said, interdisciplinary planning is not easy. Some  
13 of our ranger districts are organized that instead of  
14 having a timber management group on the ranger district  
15 they have what they call a planning group and the  
16 planning group will have a forester and a  
17 silviculturalist and an engineer and a wildlife  
18 biologist and they organize instead of functionally by  
19 resource they organize by activity. It will work  
20 either way, but the advantage of activity organization  
21 is it kind of forces people to interact in the way you  
22 want them to.

23 If you organize by timber and by  
24 recreation et cetera, then you have to, through  
25 management and commitment, make sure that there is that

1 interaction.

2                   You know, every inch of the ground, every  
3 acre doesn't have to be visited by this team. We have  
4 a lot of technology, the aerial photographs, the  
5 inventory, our own knowledge about the presence of  
6 these resources and how they react and what may or may  
7 not happen. That's the advantage of having  
8 professional people at the local level, these are  
9 people who have excellent training in university and  
10 have experience behind them, they are able to make  
11 judgments about these matters without always being  
12 right there on the spot, and then the day-to-day  
13 contact that they would have with each other, you know,  
14 sort of bridges that gap.

15                   That doesn't mean you always --  
16 everything comes out perfect, a lot of time you make  
17 mistakes, we've got a lot of them out there, but I  
18 think by and large it works pretty well and we don't  
19 end up with errors or mistakes that are irretrievable.

20                   MS. SWENARCHUK: Q. Further down the  
21 same page, Mr. Smith, in the second paragraph on the  
22 page in the fifth line of that you have indicated that  
23 caution and erring on the side of the resources is  
24 necessary if we are to have reasonable protection of  
25 long-term productivity of the land and resources.



1                   Now, with reference to forest management  
2                   and planning, what's the practical implications of that  
3                   view?

4                   A. I think there are two implications;  
5                   one is that you don't set your sights higher than what  
6                   you feel you're comfort level is. In other words, in  
7                   dealing with this Willamette National Forest Plan, I  
8                   don't think you attribute the maximum potential timber  
9                   harvest or grazing or water yield that you believe  
10                  based on the data and the evidence you have that that  
11                  resource will provide, you back off of it a little bit.

12                 This is strictly a judgment call, but I  
13                 think foresters and resource managers need to exercise  
14                 some judgment about what kind of cushion, if you will,  
15                 they have. There's nothing precise about forestry - I  
16                 shouldn't say that - it's not as precise as we would  
17                 like it to be, it's not like adding two and two and  
18                 getting four, sometimes you add two and two and you end  
19                 up getting six or three. We just don't know that much  
20                 about it.

21                 Forestry is a long-term affair, and I  
22                 refer to it as a hundred year affair and, you know, you  
23                 and I have not lived through a cycle of this. We have  
24                 learned a lot through European forestry, we have  
25                 learned a lot in monitoring our own actions, but

1       there's still a lot we don't know. There's still a lot  
2       of data we don't have. Despite a fairly comprehensive  
3       inventory in the United States, there's still a lot of  
4       things we don't know about our forests. It's just too  
5       big, and I'm sure you're in the same boat.

6                So what we've told our people is, don't  
7       maximize outputs or conditions or responses based on  
8       what you know, back off a bit, leave yourself room for  
9       some error, use some caution, and that really is what  
10      I'm suggesting here, is I think everyone in forestry,  
11      with few exceptions, that should be the case. We  
12      simply don't know that much.

13               MADAM CHAIR: Shall we break for lunch,  
14      Ms. Swenarchuk?

15               MS. SWENARCHUK: Yes.

16               MADAM CHAIR: We will be back at 1:30,  
17      Mr. Smith.

18               MS. SWENARCHUK: Yes.

19               MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

20      ---Luncheon recess at 12:00 p.m.

21      ---On resuming at 1:35 p.m.

22               MADAM CHAIR: Please be seated.

23               MS. SWENARCHUK: Q. Mr. Smith, on page 6  
24      of your witness statement in the seventh line of the  
25      first paragraph you indicate:

1 "To this day the Department of  
2 agriculture and the Forest Service  
3 consider rural development a part of its  
4 mission. This has provided incentive to  
5 maintain or increase market type  
6 production in the national forest."

7 Could you indicate for us what impact  
8 this mission has at the current time on forest planning  
9 and decision-making?

10 A. Rural development and community  
11 support in rural areas remains an objective of the  
12 Department of Agriculture. The Forest Service is a  
13 department of the Department of Agriculture and,  
14 although you don't see it named as such so much in the  
15 statute, it's threaded through almost every policy  
16 document that Forest Service has and it's in response  
17 to the Department's goals in rural America.

18 National forests are located for the most  
19 part in rural parts of the U.S. and it's been a  
20 tradition that these rural communities will benefit  
21 from the natural resource production and the goals of  
22 natural resource properties. So it's had an impact in  
23 the plans such as the Willamette Forest Plan.

24 There's a leaning towards rural  
25 development, economic viability, rural communities and,

1 certainly all things being equal, it falls off on that  
2 direction. That is not to say that rural development  
3 overrides good resource stewardship, it does not, it  
4 has to follow within that framework, but there is this  
5 implied objective at all times.

6 Q. Now, looking generally at the time  
7 period for production of the national forest plan, how  
8 long has it been taking the U.S. Forest Service to  
9 prepare an environmental impact statement land resource  
10 management plan and record of decision for a national  
11 forest?

12 A. The planning period has been  
13 extraordinarily long. As the Conservation Foundation  
14 critique pointed out, it's got to somehow shorten that  
15 up. It's run, you know, anywhere from five to nine  
16 years. The Willamette plan took nine years to  
17 complete, part of that period was in that period where  
18 I described it as assembling a bicycle as you're riding  
19 it, we were developing the direction and the process,  
20 testing it, modifying it, discovering new things that  
21 caused us to go back and redo. Also, on a very complex  
22 forest where the resources are very valuable and the  
23 conflicts are very intense, such as the Willamette  
24 forest, it just simply took longer to wade through it.  
25 So it's running between five and nine years.

1 I don't think that is going to be typical  
2 in the next generation of planning, I think it's going  
3 to be more like a couple of years. It will probably  
4 take that long to do it, just simply to get through the  
5 public involvement necessary to support such a plan.

6 Q. Now, this morning you referred to the  
7 question of need for inventory when you were talking  
8 with the Board. I'm not going to take you through this  
9 in any detail, but have you had an opportunity to  
10 review Forests for Tomorrow's terms and conditions 68  
11 to 76 inclusive which deal with visual, historical --  
12 historic, cultural, water, soil, recreational,  
13 fisheries resources data collections?

14 A. I have and I consider those a good  
15 start. I would prefer to see a more comprehensive  
16 inventory, not that one can do it immediately, but to  
17 set as an objective a strategic long-term objective, a  
18 comprehensive inventory of all the resources. In the  
19 interim I think this is a good start and that will  
20 certainly improve the ability to accomplish integrated  
21 planning.

22 Q. Now, a couple of specifics. In term  
23 and condition 68 subsection (ii) - which is on page 57,  
24 Madam Chair and Mr. Martel of Exhibit 1610, Forests for  
25 Tomorrow's terms and conditions - Forests for Tomorrow



1 propose that the MNR carry out, shall we say,  
2 pre-operation inspections in areas eligible for  
3 harvest. What is your view of this proposal?

4 A. I think the idea of a pre-operational  
5 inspection is an excellent idea. We have a similar  
6 provision in the Forest Service even with pretty good  
7 inventory, we call it --

8 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me. Which is the  
9 number of that term and condition?

10 MS. SWENARCHUK: It's 68, subparagraph  
11 (ii) at the bottom of page 57.

12 MADAM CHAIR: 57. Okay, thank you.

13 THE WITNESS: I think this is an  
14 excellent provision, one that resembles a Forest  
15 Service provision that we call environmental analysis  
16 and assessment.

17 It is particularly important if the  
18 inventory is limited and incomplete. What it does is  
19 allow the design of a proposal, a timber harvest  
20 proposal or a road construction project to benefit from  
21 more detailed information that is site-specific,  
22 related particularly to the ground.

23 In the Forest Service system you might  
24 have a good integrated national forest plan, and I  
25 think the Willamette plan is a fairly good one, but it

1 never gets to the detail that a planning team on the  
2 ground needs to actually make decisions about a timber  
3 harvest or a road construction project or whatever  
4 development project. There are always missing pieces  
5 of data and information.

6 A good example in the Forest Service of  
7 what we do is we look for archaeological and cultural  
8 resource values. We do not have an inventory that  
9 accounts for all of that, so we're in a sense  
10 backstopping the lack of information with a project  
11 environmental analysis and assessment which, to me,  
12 resembles very much what you're suggesting here in the  
13 pre-operational inspections.

14 It allows, before the project proceeds,  
15 to double check, make sure the soils are what we  
16 thought they were or what they should be, that there  
17 are no other resource values present that need some  
18 kind of special attention.

19 I think you must do that and it probably  
20 is more important in the case of Ontario where, you  
21 know, you have a limited inventory to begin with.

22 Q. And in term and condition No. 75 on  
23 page 60 Forests for Tomorrow is proposing that MNR  
24 ensure that the visual resources of the planning area  
25 are inventoried and evaluated for the use in timber

1 management planning.

2 I wonder if you could explain for the  
3 Board how in the U.S. system visual quality objectives  
4 are set?

5 A. The visual resource is considered one  
6 of the primary resources present on the national  
7 forest, like water or timber or recreation or anything  
8 else. We start with the premise that the visual  
9 resource occurs on every acre of national forest land.  
10 That doesn't say anything about the quality of it or  
11 the priority of reserving, but we start with that  
12 premise.

13 So that in carrying out a planning  
14 activity such as the forest plan or preparing a project  
15 proposal for timber harvest or a ski area or whatever,  
16 we begin by again inventorying the visual resource  
17 present and it kind of comes in two steps. The Forest  
18 Service has a rather elaborate process or system in  
19 doing this. It was developed by landscape architects  
20 and other resource scientists and it is contained in a  
21 series of handbooks.

22 These handbooks provide for, first,  
23 simply going out and establishing what is there, and  
24 this is kind of the physical and biological and, you  
25 know, landscape and, you know, whatever you see, and

1 there is a series of labels that helps identify these  
2 things. So No. 1 is you go out and you find out what's  
3 there.

4 The second thing you do is to match that  
5 up against what they call a sensitivity analysis and  
6 there are various levels of sensitivity. If you're  
7 talking about a piece of forested land that has a kind  
8 of a key scenic value to it that is in the far reaches  
9 of northern Ontario the sensitivity is probably not as  
10 critical as the same feature if it were within a few  
11 miles of Toronto, or if it were visible from a major  
12 trans-Canadian highway versus a temporary logging road.

13 Those two things are sort of melded  
14 together and you come up with, in effect, an inventory  
15 map of what constitutes extraordinary visual resources  
16 all the way down to very ordinary, just general forest  
17 land combined with sensitivity, and between the two the  
18 planner then knows what he or she is dealing with and  
19 then tries to establish some priorities and some  
20 objectives.

21 Now, in doing that there are a series of  
22 objectives that are sort of universal to a Forest  
23 Service planning system. One is you can preserve it, I  
24 mean, your objective is to preserve what you have and  
25 that would greatly limit any kind of development

1 activity that would alter that resource.

2 Now, that would be reserved for something  
3 that was of really high quality, unique, visual quality  
4 combined with high sensitivity adjacent to a population  
5 that is using it and enjoying it, all the way down to  
6 just a kind of a general run of the mill thing that  
7 nobody sees anyway, and so you have preservation at one  
8 end and maximum modification - is the term they use -  
9 on the other end and then you have several things sort  
10 of in between; partial modification and partial  
11 retention and retention and then so on.

12 So there's probably a half a dozen  
13 objectives that can be described in these various  
14 labels, and the planner then tries to sort those out  
15 and, depending on the alternative that one is building,  
16 if you have an alternative that is leaning heavily  
17 towards development and maximum production, you  
18 probably don't have as much preservation or retention,  
19 you have much more maximum modification and  
20 modification; if you're looking at an alternative that  
21 features non-market and lower market values, then you  
22 probably would move over towards the preservation side  
23 and retention and partial modification.

24 So you inventory it and then you stack it  
25 up with other kinds of values and decide what your



1 objective is. Once an objective is selected, like  
2 retention, that means something to the Forest Service  
3 people and then they proceed to manage a timber sale or  
4 a road or a trail or a recreation area or a mine to  
5 meet that visual resource objective. And, as I say, we  
6 have a series of landscape management handbooks that  
7 assist our people in doing that.

8 At one time the Forest Service was the  
9 largest single employer in the world of landscape  
10 architects. I can't say if that is still true, but we  
11 have a great number of them and almost every ranger  
12 district either has one or certainly every ranger  
13 district has access to one that helps implement that  
14 direction.

15 Q. Now, I would like us to turn to an  
16 outline of the Forest Service planning process and then  
17 leading immediately into a discussion of the  
18 development of alternatives in the planning process.  
19 Perhaps you'll want to use the overhead on the forest  
20 planning process which is the fourth page of Exhibit  
21 1753.

22 A. One of the things I'm not is an  
23 artist. You can say: Ah, I don't need to mention that  
24 to you, but...

25 Here is a squiggly line carrying us

1 through the Forest Service planning process and it's  
2 rooted in the National Forest Management Act, the  
3 statute and the regulations that grew out of the  
4 committee of scientists who worked to develop a  
5 planning process for the Forest Service.

6 I'm certainly not saying this is the only  
7 way to plan, but it does break it out into small pieces  
8 that one can see the sequence of events leading up to a  
9 plan, implementing it, monitoring it, and then revising  
10 it and amending it as need be. So we are looking there  
11 at the forest planning process.

12 There are two things I would like to  
13 mention that are sort of characteristic throughout this  
14 process and one is public involvement. The public  
15 involvement touches every one of these steps and there  
16 are certain things that the Forest Service needs to do  
17 and there are certain things the public can contribute  
18 in each one of these cases.

19 The other thing that is common and  
20 threaded throughout the process is the  
21 interdisciplinary approach, and we designate teams that  
22 accomplish that for us. Now, both public involvement  
23 and the interdisciplinary approach are within the  
24 statute. I mean, it's the law and you're simply  
25 looking at ways to accomplish that.

1                   So given that as sort of an overall  
2 backdrop, the first thing we need to do is to identify  
3 the purpose and need. Now, there's a lot of statute  
4 and regulations and there are obvious things that point  
5 towards establishing purpose for a national forest  
6 plan, it's kind of the what that we're dealing with  
7 there.

8                   The second step would be to prepare  
9 planning criteria, the criteria that we would use in  
10 conducting our activities, designing our activities and  
11 measuring our success, that sort of thing.

12                  Then we get right into really what was  
13 more traditional planning, collecting the data, the  
14 information. This presumes an inventory of some kind,  
15 an inventory on forested and wildlands is never  
16 complete but you do the best you can with the resources  
17 that you have and match it up against the kind of  
18 things you're going to do.

19                  If you're not going to do much but  
20 protect it or keep it in a custodial stage, then you  
21 don't need a whole lot of data, but if you expect to  
22 have high yields of timber and, you know, utilize with  
23 large numbers of people for recreation, then you have  
24 to have more data in order to make the kind of  
25 decisions that will support and facilitate that within

1 the capability of the land and resource to sustain  
2 that.

3 On our forests, you know, sustainable  
4 multiple use is part of the law and, therefore, our  
5 planners have to be careful that we keep it within that  
6 framework.

7 After the data and information is  
8 collected, another step is referred to is analysing the  
9 management situation. And that is kind of looking at  
10 the resources and the demand side, the public desires,  
11 all the things that you can say about the situation  
12 regarding the public land and the social relationships  
13 to it. That is important to frame up the decisions  
14 you're likely to make on the other end in setting  
15 targets and establishing what lands will be used for  
16 what.

17 At that point, and again rooted in law,  
18 is a formulation of alternatives. The statutes and the  
19 regulations call for developing a range of alternatives  
20 that represent almost any feasible use of the land all  
21 the way from practically preservation to maximum  
22 production of kind of market goods and everything  
23 inbetween, and the idea is to have, you know, something  
24 that represents, you know, most of the major points on  
25 that continuum.

1                   Let me say again, the public is  
2   interfacing in each step of the way here. The public  
3   often has data and information that the Forest Service  
4   doesn't have. We run across families, communities for  
5   example that live in and around these forests for  
6   generations and Forest Service people, like myself,  
7   come and go and we never, you know, know the resources  
8   like certain people in the community might know a  
9   particular area or a particular resource, so there's  
10  always opportunity for the public to share this kind of  
11  information, analysing the management situation is  
12  another thing, certainly formulating your range of  
13  alternatives is another.

14                  The regulations and the Forest Service  
15  direction calls for alternatives to be formulated. Our  
16  National Environmental Policy Act which we must also  
17  follow is very prescriptive in developing alternatives  
18  leading to decisions that affect the environment.

19                  The next step, what the interdisciplinary  
20  plan does in concert with the public then is to  
21  estimate the effect of alternatives, what effect does  
22  that have on resource capability, what kind of response  
23  will you get from the resource if you do that. And  
24  again that is going to range all the way from a kind of  
25  preservation side to a maximum development and



1 production side.

2 At that point you move into the  
3 evaluation of alternatives. You kind of establish  
4 what's going to happen, the effect on, then you want to  
5 ask yourself: Well, given the alternative structure,  
6 what are its values vis-a-vis various public interests  
7 and priorities, values, so forth.

8 At that point you've got enough  
9 information you can begin to deal with what  
10 alternatives should we selected, and we're getting into  
11 what we would call a draft environmental statement  
12 where the analysis and assessment are prepared in draft  
13 and we're looking for a tentative decision or what we  
14 would call a preferred alternative, and each  
15 alternative then is separately evaluated, described in  
16 terms of its effect and response and is compared with  
17 all the other alternatives and with the public  
18 assessment.

19 Our planners then are able to select one  
20 that appears to be the preferred, and then it goes  
21 through an environmental statement issuance, a period  
22 of time when the public has formal opportunity to react  
23 to that, suggest, recommend, and finally the Forest  
24 Service takes all of that information and issues a  
25 final environmental statement which you have on your

1 desk and selects an alternative for approval.

2 The regional forester in this case can  
3 approve an alternative plan and then the forest  
4 supervisor, district ranger implement that plan,  
5 monitor it, evaluate it and have the feedback from the  
6 monitoring, and it comes back into the planning process  
7 for amending the plan or revising it and certainly  
8 accumulating that kind of information so that in 10 to  
9 15 years the plan will be revised and brought up to  
10 date.

11 So that's in kind of a nutshell the 10  
12 steps that they will go through to develop and  
13 implement a plan.

14 Q. I would like to turn now to the  
15 source book.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me, Ms. Swenarchuk.  
17 Are we coming into the discussion of public involvement  
18 in more detail?

19 MS. SWENARCHUK: Immediately after the  
20 alternatives. It can be done either way, but my  
21 decision was that if you see the outline of the system  
22 first it would help you then in evaluating public  
23 consultation afterwards.

24 Q. If we look then at the source book.  
25 In my source book it's the fourth tab, it's the

1       USDA-82, provides the regulations for implementing the  
2       procedural provisions of the National Environmental  
3       Policy Act. Is this what's commonly referred to as the  
4       NEPA procedures, Mr. Smith?

5                   A. Yes.

6                   MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me, Ms. Swenarchuk,  
7       where are we?

8                   MS. SWENARCHUK: The NEPA procedures  
9       handbook looks like this (indicating). In my source  
10      book it's the fourth.

11                  MADAM CHAIR: Is it Volume I or II, A or  
12      B rather?

13                  MS. SWENARCHUK: Well, the original only  
14      had one volume.

15                  MADAM CHAIR: I see ours has been  
16      divided. Okay.

17      ---Discussion off the record.

18                  MS. SWENARCHUK: Perhaps Mr. Pascoe  
19      knows. Were the articles rearranged?

20                  MR. PASCOE: Not at all. They were just  
21      simply divided into two.

22                  MADAM CHAIR: Okay. The NEPA procedures  
23      handbook?

24                  MS. SWENARCHUK: That's right.

25                  MADAM CHAIR: Okay, we have got it.

1 MS. SWENARCHUK: Q. And before we look  
2 at that, I think if you turn to the page that is  
3 numbered 1-13 -- 45.1-13 in that publication; do you  
4 have that, Mr. Smith?

5 A. Yes, I do.

6 Q. And then if you look at the bottom of  
7 the right-hand column at what is paragraph 1502.14 you  
8 see a heading Alternatives Including the Proposed  
9 Action, and it reads:

10 "This section is the heart of the  
11 environmental impact statement. Based on  
12 information and analysis presented in  
13 sections on the affected environment and  
14 the environmental consequences, it should  
15 present the environmental impacts of the  
16 proposal and the alternatives in  
17 comparative form, thus sharply defining  
18 the issues and providing a clear basis  
19 for choice among options by the  
20 decision-maker and the public."

21 Now, is this the basic instruction to the  
22 Forest Service planners about the development of  
23 alternatives?

24 A. Yes, it is.

25 MS. SWENARCHUK: All right. And then,

1 Madam Chair, Mr. Martel, several subsections include  
2 the description of the alternatives required, which I  
3 won't go through.

4 Q. Could you indicate, Mr. Smith,  
5 please, where in the Willamette National Forest  
6 materials a discussion of these alternatives can be  
7 found?

8 MS. SWENARCHUK: Before you go to those  
9 published documents, I'll provide the Board with our  
10 summary of the alternatives that were included in that  
11 plan, and I would ask that that be made the next  
12 exhibit, Madam Chair.

13 MADAM CHAIR: This will be Exhibit 1759  
14 and it's excerpted from which exhibit?

15 MS. SWENARCHUK: Madam Chair, just for  
16 you to have a convenient summary of the alternatives  
17 that were considered in this plan, what we have done is  
18 compile the description of the alternatives that occurs  
19 on the alternative maps which are in your package  
20 1754G.

21 ---EXHIBIT NO. 1759: Summary of alternatives  
22 considered in plan including  
23 description of alternatives that  
occur on alternative maps in  
Exhibit 1754G.

24 MS. SWENARCHUK: Q. Now, Mr. Smith --

25 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me, Ms. Swenarchuk.



1 The description writing is in your words?

2 MS. SWENARCHUK: No, it's removed from  
3 the maps.

4 MADAM CHAIR: All right, thank you.

5 MS. SWENARCHUK: Q. So, Mr. Smith, if  
6 you would indicate for them first where in the volumes  
7 these alternatives can be found and discussions, and  
8 then perhaps you would briefly explain to them in fact  
9 the change that happened over the process of this plan  
10 between the original proposal and the alternative that  
11 was chosen?

12 So could we start then with where in the  
13 materials these alternatives are discussed.

14 A. All right. This is handled in the  
15 environmental impact statement. So you're looking at  
16 not the plan with the black face to it, but the large  
17 document entitled Final Environmental Impact Statement.

18 Q. That's Exhibit 1754C.

19 A. Yes. Now, I do want to say that  
20 there was a draft environmental statement, this is the  
21 final, so the draft environmental statement contained  
22 also some alternatives, in fact several more and  
23 different ones than the final, and the difference is  
24 that as the public interfaced with the Forest Service,  
25 these alternatives were changed, some of them changed,

1 some of them dropped, some new ones came aboard.

2 Therefore, when you look at the final  
3 environmental statement and you'll notice that there's  
4 alternative A and then it jumps to D I think, you'll  
5 see some missing, B and C are missing. The reason for  
6 that is during the draft environmental statement  
7 process the public and the Forest Service dropped them  
8 for one reason or another and added other ones. Okay.

9 Also, in this case, the preferred  
10 alternative in the draft did not survive and the  
11 selected alternative in the final was something that  
12 wasn't even in the draft in total, it was a combination  
13 or some additions and some modifications.

14 So where you'll find the discussion of  
15 this is in the final environmental impact statement,  
16 that is 1754C, beginning in Section 2, page 23.

17 These documents have a complicated  
18 numbering system and that is probably one thing that  
19 the Conservation Foundation was suggesting, make this a  
20 little easier, but it's Section 2, page 23 and it talks  
21 about the range of alternatives.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Give me that page number  
23 again, please, Mr. Smith?

24 THE WITNESS: Okay. It's Chapter 2. The  
25 chapters are divided by the green pages.

1 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, mm-hmm.

2 THE WITNESS: Page 23, Chapter 2.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

4 THE WITNESS: There you'll see a  
5 discussion about the range of alternatives. It talks  
6 about required alternatives, about the no action, and  
7 the one that responds to the National Resources  
8 Planning Act Plan that established national targets and  
9 then emphasis on non-market, emphasis on market, and  
10 then there's a lot of discretion about developing them  
11 inbetween. At any rate, this is where that is  
12 discussed.

13 Now, you have been provided a short  
14 compilation of the final environmental impact  
15 alternatives in this little handout that begins with  
16 alternative A goes to D, J, K, and all that is is just  
17 a very brief summary of what that particular  
18 alternative features and, again, they run all the way  
19 from no action, to less emphasis on market, to greater  
20 emphasis on market and the same thing with non-market.

21 So you end up with a kind of continuum of  
22 possibilities that can be analysed and compared with  
23 one another.

24 There is a section in this same document  
25 also in Chapter 2 on page 57, the beginning of the

1 comparison, and you'll see a lot of narrative and also  
2 a number of charts that try to summarize the  
3 difference.

4 So on page 57 you see the beginning of  
5 the comparison section and if one thumbed through there  
6 you would see something on old growth, you would see  
7 something on wildlife and timber, water, and just more  
8 or less a conversational discussion of the comparison,  
9 but if you'll turn to page 135 you'll see a chart that  
10 kind of summarizes a lot of the major issues and  
11 compares in units of measure the various alternatives  
12 to one another.

13 Now, that provides the decision-maker and  
14 the public both a kind of quick picture of what all  
15 this means. The narrative probably describes better  
16 sort of the state or the future condition, and the  
17 chart explains some of the numbers that go with that.

18 Now, it turns out that from a statute  
19 standpoint is very critical. The National  
20 Environmental Policy Act calls for this kind of thing,  
21 the regulations call for it, our directions call for  
22 it. This is a matter that can throw the Forest Service  
23 into court very fast. If we don't provide an adequate  
24 range of alternatives and an alternative that  
25 represents, you know, a reasonable distribution through

1 that range, then we can very likely be taken to court  
2 as an inadequate planning effort.

3 So the Forest Service takes a great deal  
4 of care to do this and, in fact, it's valuable because  
5 it allows the decision-maker and the public a chance to  
6 see, you know, what are the real options for managing  
7 that property.

8 MS. SWENARCHUK: Now, I'm sure the Board  
9 will want to take its leisure time to read the entire  
10 final environmental impact statement.

11 MR. MARTEL: Tonight.

12 MS. SWENARCHUK: Sure.

13 Q. I would ask you to turn now, Mr.  
14 Smith, unless there are additional comments you want to  
15 make on that volume?

16 A. I don't think so.

17 Q. To the maps that you have posted from  
18 the plan. Perhaps we could take down 1756.

19 MS. SWENARCHUK: Now, Madam Chair --

20 THE WITNESS: It's hard for you to see  
21 this.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Do we have these maps in  
23 our envelope?

24 THE WITNESS: Yes, you do.

25 MS. SWENARCHUK: They are part of Exhibit



1 1754G, the alternatives maps, and I would suggest,  
2 Madam Chair, that we not ascribe any further exhibit  
3 numbers to these, it will simply be alternative A and  
4 alternative W posted from exhibit 1754G.

5 As well, underneath we have the final  
6 forest plan map which I believe comes from your other  
7 map package 1754F, however, let's deal with the first  
8 two first.

9 Q. And, perhaps just one preliminary  
10 question now. Mr. Smith, with regard to the  
11 development and analysis of alternatives that occurred  
12 during this planning process, was there an alternative  
13 considered that did not respond to natinal legislative  
14 requirements?

15 A. The answer to that is yes. It's a  
16 sort of extraordinary circumstance. When the draft  
17 environmental statement was issued with this range of  
18 alternatives, the timber industry in Oregon and  
19 Washington objected to the absence of an alternative  
20 that did not carry with it what we call management  
21 requirements. Management requirements is a term we use  
22 for some of these statute that came along after the  
23 planning process perhaps started or certainly came  
24 along after the old plan that was in existence was  
25 prepared. They had to do with threatened and

1 endangered species, new standards for water quality,  
2 rather broad ranging environmental concerns.

3           The Forest Service felt because it would  
4 be unlawful for us to select an alternative that didn't  
5 meet the statute, didn't prepare an alternative that  
6 reflected that. The industry, timber industry took the  
7 Forest Service to court and asked that that be done -  
8 and I forget just exactly how that came about, if there  
9 was a settlement or a direction of the court - anyway,  
10 the Forest Service did prepare in the final  
11 environmental statement an alternative that in effect  
12 was contrary to existing law, did not provide the  
13 requirements for threatened, endangered species, water  
14 quality, et cetera, et cetera.

15           I will say this about that, even though  
16 it was not an alternative that the Forest Service could  
17 unilaterally choose because it was unlawful, it did  
18 provide an opportunity to compare what was and what is.  
19 You know, I'm not sure that that has a lot of value,  
20 but it still provided that comparison, and I suspect  
21 that is what the timber industry wanted to show, that  
22 there were certain costs associated with national  
23 requirements and, you know, I guess one view is that  
24 the public ought to know what they are and be able to  
25 measure them as they proceed.

1 Q. Now, is that alternative the one that  
2 is on the second page of Exhibit 1759 described as  
3 alternative NC, no change?

4 A. That's correct, no change, and  
5 literally what that means is taking the 1977 land use  
6 plan for the Willamette and implementing it as is  
7 without these statutory requirements. Now, there's a  
8 lot of statutory requirements that are already in that,  
9 but it was the subsequent requirements after 1977.

10 MR. FREIDIN: I'm sorry, where are you?

11 MS. SWNENARCHUK: NC, Mr. Freidin--

12 MR. FREIDIN: Thank you.

13 MS. SWENARCHUK: --on page 2 of 1759.

14 Now, as you can see, Madam Chair, we  
15 haven't posted all the alternatives, we don't propose  
16 to go through all of them, we simply posted the maps  
17 for alternative A indicated as a no action alternative,  
18 and alternative W which became the preferred  
19 alternative.

20 Q. Mr. Smith, would you indicate to the  
21 Board, using the maps as you wish, the results of the  
22 planning process that can be seen by comparing the  
23 beginning and the end on those two maps?

24 A. All right. Both of these  
25 alternatives are required in the planning process; that

1 is, you have to have a proposal which is the selection  
2 or the preferred and we were required to add a no  
3 action alternative, that is alternative A.

4 Alternative A is no action; in other  
5 words, the 1977 plan would continue with the addition  
6 of management requirements as reflected in subsequent  
7 statute, and that is the difference between alternative  
8 A, the no action, and I will say the kind of illegal  
9 one, no change; that is, we're not changing the 1977  
10 management plan except to bring it up to date per  
11 statute.

12 Okay. So we thought it would be useful  
13 to just show you the difference between the two, major  
14 differences, and you can just look at it at a glance  
15 and you can see that the management areas that are  
16 depicted in various shades and colours and cross  
17 hatching, speckling, all that kind of thing, there's  
18 just a lot more of it in the selected alternative, and  
19 that's because as the Forest Service went through the  
20 process and the public interfaced with it there was  
21 just a whole lot more detail that they were concerned  
22 about, that specific areas should have special  
23 treatment.

24 I talked earlier today about a sense of  
25 place. The proposal really acknowledges special places

1 a lot better than the old 1977 plan. The 1977 plan is  
2 kind of -- the solid brown area was termed as kind of  
3 general forest area and it was available for usual  
4 timber management practices and really was, you know,  
5 essentially the base of the timber harvest program.

6 You can see that that has been altered.  
7 There's still a lot of brown on that forest, but  
8 there's a lot of other little special places that have  
9 cropped up, maybe riparian areas or special wildlife  
10 habitat, there are scenic resources, research natural  
11 areas, provision for biological diversity, a host of  
12 things that refine the old plan and the new plan.

13 To give you an idea just in numbers, you  
14 can't see these things, but there were - 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,  
15 6, 7, 8 - eight new management areas that related to a  
16 number of things, like I mentioned before, scenic or  
17 habitat, special provisions that reduce the  
18 availability of land for just kind of the usual  
19 intensive timber harvest.

20 The other thing I would like to mention  
21 to you is that the brown area which is the general  
22 forest area, the area primarily available for timber  
23 harvest, was reduced from the old 1977 plan from about  
24 51 per cent of the total forested area to about 38 per  
25 cent of the total forested area, and all that does is



1 just reflect increased value and priority for  
2 non-timber values.

3 That doesn't mean that timber isn't  
4 harvested on some of these other areas, it is, but it's  
5 not done in the usual way, it's modified to allow more  
6 fuller realization of alternative values, mostly  
7 non-market aesthetic values.

8 Now, the other maps you have in there,  
9 you know, fall on either side of these in terms of  
10 market emphasis or non-market emphasis and they will  
11 look sort of similar. You know, it's not that the  
12 whole wide world is open, because we're not going to  
13 clearcut and burn the entire Willamette, we're not  
14 going to put the entire Willamette in wilderness and  
15 the direction tells us to, you know, choose  
16 alternatives that can conceivably be picked, don't put  
17 it strongly, don't put an alternative that can't be  
18 chosen. That is the reason we didn't choose to put up  
19 the illegal one.

20 Those things can be cast off as sort of  
21 benchmarks, if you will, ways of comparing, you know,  
22 what it could be or what it could cost, but they don't  
23 represent alternatives that are pickable that can be  
24 chosen.

25 Q. A couple of specific questions. I

1 don't know whether you answered this this morning.

2 Where does the Willamette Forest rank amongst national  
3 forests with regard to its level of timber production?

4 A. This particular national forest is  
5 the largest timber producing forest in the national  
6 forest system, it approaches a billion board feet per  
7 year, it has in the past, and in fact it has produced  
8 that much.

9 Its potential yield, if you wanted to  
10 take this property and manage it like an industrial  
11 forest, it would produce on a sustained basis in excess  
12 of a billion board feet per year, and that is a lot of  
13 wood. It probably is half again as much as any other  
14 national forest.

15 Q. And my second question relates to  
16 those checkerboard areas that can be seen on both maps.  
17 Can you explain what those areas represent, please?

18 A. The checkerboard with the brown and  
19 the white, the white indicates private lands. The  
20 national forests are not solid national forests public  
21 lands, there are private inholds. This particular  
22 inholding is held by a company that acquired over a  
23 period of years what we call a railroad grant.

24 In the early pioneering days of our  
25 country the government granted alternate sections, one

1 mile square sections to the railroads or the wagon  
2 companies to provide capital to build the railroads and  
3 those lands were used by the railroads to do that and  
4 generally passed on to other private hands to provide  
5 the capital to build the railroads.

6 In this case these lands are held by a  
7 large timber company that manages them for sustained  
8 yield of timber products and, you know, it really is a  
9 matter of cooperating with them on road access. And  
10 the national forest attempt to, you know, provide some  
11 tie to other kinds of values that are not reflected in  
12 their objectives adjacent to those lands.

13 Q. Do you want to use the final forest  
14 plan then for further information of the Board. This  
15 then is the forest plan map which is part of the  
16 tree-map set that is Exhibit 1754F.

17 A. As was said, this becomes the forest  
18 plan map, it should be identical to alternative W, on a  
19 larger scale and it's a little different process, it's  
20 not computer process developed, it's off the forest  
21 base map, contains all the roads and streams and the  
22 usual features that you see on maps, but the important  
23 thing here is that the management areas as depicted in  
24 the margin here are identified on the maps and you can  
25 take these management areas and you can go back to the

1 forest plan.

2 And if you wanted to pick, for example,  
3 11D, if you go back to the plan, look up 11D, it would  
4 tell you how many acres was in it, what the  
5 prescription was, what its purposes were, and it would  
6 then, you know, imply the kind of management that would  
7 be effected on the ground.

8 So when the district ranger has this map  
9 he has a fairly good sense of where things happen and  
10 how much happens. Understand, you know, this is a  
11 large area, we're talking about from tip to tip here  
12 well over a hundred miles, probably 150 miles, so  
13 there's not the kind of detail that a district ranger  
14 needs to go out and make a timber sale or build a road,  
15 but he has a lot of guidance here, a lot of objectives,  
16 he's got a vision of what should be and then he turns  
17 to his specilists to actually design the project  
18 proposal to comply with that.

19 MS. SWENARCHUK: Those are all my  
20 questions with regard to preparation of alternatives,  
21 Madam Chair, Mr. Martel, unless you have further  
22 questions. Just one brief one on another subject.

23 Q. Mr. Smith, there has been discussion  
24 before the Board about the quantification of non-timber  
25 values in U.S. national forest plans. Was such

1 quantification done with the Willamette National Forest  
2 Plan?

3 A. Yes, it was. In the planning process  
4 we tried to attach values to everything. Some are very  
5 easy to do; timber, you know, we know how to quantify  
6 that in dollars and cents against units of measure.

7 We can do the same thing for grazing,  
8 animal unit months grazing on range lands. You know,  
9 water has certain values, it can be quantified.  
10 Wildlife begins to get into a little gray area. Some  
11 wildlife you can relate to hunting and fishing licences  
12 and guides, that sort of thing.

13 Then you get into some non-market values  
14 that are very difficult to quantify and, in fact, we  
15 don't even do it. In the middle are those that we do  
16 but there's not a total agreement on what they  
17 represent. In this plan you'll see values placed on  
18 those things.

19 Q. Is that what we see in Exhibit 1754D,  
20 that is Appendix Volume I to the final environmental  
21 impact statement at page B69?

22 A. Yes, it is.

23 SWENARCHUK: That was page B69, Madam  
24 Chair.

25 MADAM CHAIR: B?



1 MS. SWENARCHUK: B for Bob.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Mm-hmm. Excuse me, Mr.

3 Smith?

4 THE WITNESS: Yes.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Is your evidence that even  
6 in those situations where you might not know if you're  
7 accurate, you have put some sort of value on non-market  
8 resources?

9 THE WITNESS: Yes, on some non-market --

10 MADAM CHAIR: Not all?

11 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say we don't  
12 think we're accurate. There is debate about these  
13 values, they're not precise like measuring in the  
14 marketplace for timber.

15 So if you look on page 69, Part B, 69  
16 you'll see the recreation benefits valued in the little  
17 chart at the top of the page.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Mm-hmm.

19 THE WITNESS: Table B25.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, we do see that.

21 THE WITNESS: Now, those values, I would  
22 categorize as, you know, there can be arguments about  
23 them. We have valued wilderness at \$17.50 per visitor  
24 day, a visitor day being 12 hours in a wilderness.

25 There will be some people who say it's

1       worth a lot more than that, there are others who say  
2       it's not worth hardly anything, and you can see that we  
3       place a value on a lot of that similar sort of  
4       activity. We have not run into any great  
5       controversies, it's more of an academic argument.

6                   MADAM CHAIR: On page B70.

7                   THE WITNESS: Yes.

8                   MADAM CHAIR: There are eight values  
9       listed including lifestyles and old growth and air  
10      quality and water quality and are you saying that no  
11      market values were put on those resources?

12                  THE WITNESS: We have not placed market  
13      values on those for this plan. There have been  
14      attempts to do some of that and, quite frankly, nobody  
15      has been very satisfied with that.

16                  The people who are dealing with this  
17      issue in the United States now, the people in the  
18      university and economists are, I think, inclined to  
19      tell us don't try to do that, you're not going to be  
20      successful and you get mired down in arguments and they  
21      are just not comparable.

22                  We do consider those values in a  
23      subjective way and they become value judgments. The  
24      value judgments are validated by the public's advice to  
25      you and recommendations.

1 MADAM CHAIR: Mm-hmm.

2 THE WITNESS: The public can intuitively  
3 say, yes, I think this value should override another  
4 value, even if you -- it might be timber, for example,  
5 timber's worth so much and people will say: Well, you  
6 know, biodiversity is worth more than that to me, I'm  
7 willing to give up this much timber value to have this  
8 much assurance that our biodiversity is maintained over  
9 a period of time.

10 MS. SWENARCHUK: Madam Chair, I want to  
11 turn next to the public involvement question. Perhaps  
12 we can take the break now and begin that after the  
13 break?

14 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, we will take our  
15 afternoon break now.

16 THE WITNESS: All right, thank you.

17 ---Recess at 2:35 p.m.

18 ---On resuming at 2:55 p.m.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Please be seated.

20 MS. SWENARCHUK: So now, Madam Chair and  
21 Mr. Martel, to the question of public involvement.

22 Q. In terms of the question of public  
23 involvement in planning, I'm going to ask Mr. Smith to  
24 outline for you from beginning to end how this is done  
25 in the U.S. Forest Service planning process with some

1 references to the Willamette materials and how it's  
2 recorded there.

3 A. Okay. Of course public involvement  
4 is required by statute, so there's no choice in the  
5 matter, it's more a question of how best to do it.  
6 It's in planning regulations, it's very specific.  
7 There's no need to look at this, but let me just read  
8 it:

9 "Shall be used early and often throughout  
10 the development of the plans."

11 And, again, that is a little easier said  
12 than done, but the Forest Service does have quite a bit  
13 of experience now in doing this.

14 I mentioned to you on that planning  
15 process wiggly line that public involvement should be  
16 involvement not just review. I think the Forest  
17 Service has erred on this in the past and one reason  
18 that we perhaps contributed to confrontation and  
19 polarization is not getting the public involved early  
20 enough and in a collaborative way rather than just  
21 making a decision or preparing a document and getting  
22 review. So the key here is public involvement and on a  
23 continuous basis. It needs to be participative and not  
24 reactive.

25 Let me draw something, a kind of a

1 philosophy behind public involvement for you.

2 If you look at a natural resource issue  
3 or decision, things to do with the land, particularly  
4 public land and resources, you might say that there is  
5 a continuum of factors and elements and concerns. On  
6 one side of that equation is the role of the  
7 professional, the agency, professional forester,  
8 biologist, landscape architect , computer science,  
9 whatever, and then on every question there's another  
10 side, it has to do with the social-political aspects of  
11 it.

12 You know, lands and resources really  
13 don't care what you do with them as long as you don't  
14 destroy them or abuse them. The land and the resource  
15 doesn't care if you decide to manage it as wilderness  
16 or manage it as some kind of utilitarian way, as long  
17 as the basic productivity is preserved and it can be  
18 sustained for ever and ever. The land is neutral on  
19 that.

20 Professionals and agencies and resource  
21 scientists ought to be neutral too, and I think at  
22 least in the U.S. society the expectation is that they  
23 will be neutral, like the land is neutral, the  
24 guardians, good stewards, but basically be willing to  
25 manage the land in any way that or for any purpose that



1 the owner, the citizen owner of those public lands  
2 wishes.

3 So a professional has this side of the  
4 equation and has to do with the stewardship and  
5 sustainability of the land, that kind of thing; and the  
6 professional and the agency have to stand up pretty  
7 hard and rigid on that.

8 On this side though is the citizen owner  
9 of the public who should ultimately decide what the  
10 land is to be used for, whether it should be  
11 wilderness, high yield forestry, what combination of  
12 both and everything inbetween.

13 I think there's a lot of difficulty with  
14 agencies and people like myself knowing where this line  
15 is, and my personal biases through the years I'm sure  
16 have crossed over where I'd say I've got into the  
17 social-political side and said: This is what's good  
18 for forestry, this is what we must do in managing the  
19 lands. And there's nothing wrong with me having a  
20 value judgment on that, just be careful not to  
21 represent it as an absolute in terms of the lands and  
22 resources capability of sustaining that particular  
23 activity, or whether it is right or wrong. I should  
24 operate on this side of the equation in terms of, you  
25 know, where I'm rigid, where I won't give.

1 I think that is hard to do and I don't  
2 think it's been done very well, not by the U.S. Forest  
3 Service. I think we've ourselves going over here and  
4 that has caused us to probably lag behind a little bit.

5 I have worked with people in the Forest  
6 Service who really down deep feel that a tree left to  
7 die and fall over is almost immoral because it's not  
8 being used, and there are folks like that that really  
9 believe it, but the majority of the public doesn't view  
10 it that way at all; that, you know, there are other  
11 values connected with trees and forests that are  
12 equally as legitimate.

13 So the role of the public involvement to  
14 me is to deal with this side. That side is  
15 accomplished; in other words, the what of the land,  
16 then the agency and the resource specialists can  
17 determine how to do it.

18 In the ideal world that is the way it  
19 would operate. We would not have a lot of detail and  
20 the public coming to us about about how to do things,  
21 we would be told how to do, we provide a vision, an  
22 objective, a desired state in the future, and then the  
23 Forest Service and the resource scientists would go  
24 about doing that with the best possible scientific  
25 application. That is the ideal world and I don't think

1       it's worked quite that way.

2                   So we have to have sort of structured and  
3       mandatory public involvement and, to some extent, the  
4       regulations and the statute even go beyond that and  
5       tell us what we will or will not do, and we will talk  
6       about some of those later, about clearcut size  
7       limitations and doing things certain ways that really  
8       are on the outside.

9                   Okay. You remember again the squiggly  
10      line of all the planning steps, the 10 steps leading to  
11      the implementation and monitoring of a plan. The two  
12      things that were common were the interdisciplinary  
13      approach and public involvement, and I personally feel,  
14      and the Forest Service is very committed to that if  
15      we're going to be successful in having a plan that will  
16      be durable and represent balance with the public.

17                  Now, how to do that. That is really  
18      somewhat difficult. In the Willamette planning  
19      process, which is I think fairly typical of the other  
20      126 efforts in the Forest Service, there is a whole  
21      host of things that happened.

22                  I think initially you talk about, you  
23      just announce you're going to do this, let everybody  
24      know that now is the time, we're going to follow these  
25      statutes and these regulations, it's time for us to

1 plan, and you develop some kind of a schedule so that  
2 people know about it and can anticipate when and where  
3 and how much their participation will be.

4 I think then the next thing is to not  
5 just leave it to chance that people will come forward  
6 but to stimulate and initiate invitations and provide  
7 encouragement, facilitate people interfacing with the  
8 agency.

9 I think too often the Forest Service just  
10 hopes nobody would notice, we could just kind of go  
11 forward because, after all, we knew pretty much what  
12 ought to be done, we're the professionals, why should  
13 we ask anybody, they don't know anything anyway, and  
14 that kind of attitude got us into a whole bunch of  
15 trouble later on, people were interested and did have a  
16 role.

17 So there needs to be invitation, a  
18 genuine invitation that is workable for the public to  
19 review and comment and participate and offer and share  
20 and so forth.

21 I think something that helps too is to  
22 provide along the way a feedback. It is a terribly  
23 complicated and long arduous chore going through one of  
24 these plans. I think people have to have it kind of  
25 condensed into understandable terms, something that

1 they can relate to, and I noticed that one thing that  
2 helps is for the forest supervisor to issue  
3 periodically progress reports, just little newsletters  
4 to his citizen groups, stockholders if you will, here's  
5 where we are in the process, this is what we're doing,  
6 this is the next step, I hope you're getting ready for  
7 it.

8 This is the way we handled the last step,  
9 very informal, very conversational, not very  
10 bureaucratic and not too structured but just feedback.  
11 That can be done in mailed reports or it can be done in  
12 little meetings or news announcements, media features,  
13 et cetera.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me, Mr. Smith. On  
15 your first point, what did you do on the Willamette  
16 Forest Plan with respect to inviting the public to  
17 participate?

18 THE WITNESS: The Willamette plan, to my  
19 knowledge now, I wasn't there through this whole  
20 process of course, but they made an announcement, they  
21 outlined a schedule, a tentative schedule, sort of  
22 outlined the steps and they did this through media  
23 announcements, through publications of various kinds.

24 The Willamette did, I think, a very good  
25 job of beginning early with little progress reports and



1 announcements, status reports, and so anybody who  
2 wanted to be on the mailing list was on the mailing  
3 list. And I don't know how many, but it must have been  
4 hundreds and hundreds of people that did receive these  
5 little reports from time to time. And they're very  
6 personal, the forest supervisor signed them and talked  
7 about it in conversational terms.

8 So they did that and then they proceeded  
9 to provide a number of opportunities of various kinds  
10 through the course of the planning period and, you  
11 know, I have an idea at one point a certain kind of  
12 approach was featured and another point, maybe because  
13 it lent itself to that, another kind of approach was  
14 featured.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Can you point the Board to  
16 where these public processes are discussed in the  
17 Willamette reports; are they anywhere?

18 THE WITNESS: Okay. The best place for  
19 that is Volume II of the appendices to the  
20 environmental impact statement. Now, that covers --

21 MS. SWENARCHUK: That is Exhibit 1754E,  
22 Madam Chair.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

24 THE WITNESS: That is the small -- or the  
25 smallest of the large green books. Unfortunately that

1 is primarily a summary of the period of public  
2 involvement during the review of the draft  
3 environmental statement.

4 I think it's a rather complete account of  
5 that, but it doesn't reach back into the earlier  
6 period. I do have some summaries that the Forest  
7 Service provided me of some of those things but they  
8 were not made exhibits, in fact I don't think FFT even  
9 has them. I do have them with me, but we may not  
10 discuss those.

11 There is a record of the kinds of things  
12 and activities that occurred prior to what is  
13 documented in this report.

14 Remember, this is only the five-month  
15 period after the draft environmental statement was  
16 issued, between that time and the final plan.

17 MS. SWENARCHUK: Is there a summary --

18 MR. MARTEL: How long will that plan  
19 remain in force?

20 THE WITNESS: Pardon me?

21 MR. MARTEL: How long does this plan  
22 remain in force?

23 THE WITNESS: Okay. Again, the  
24 regulations provide that the plan is for a 10 to  
25 15-year period. That is, I don't know why that range

1 was developed but I guess they felt that if the plan  
2 was still valid in 10 years they could extend it up to  
3 15 years, but at the end of 15 years it must be  
4 revised, you have to go through the whole process  
5 again. Now, those are the outside limits.

6 The monitoring activity provides that the  
7 plan can be revised at any time, any time the  
8 circumstances change that render the plan, you know,  
9 inappropriate. So it's conceivable that the Willamette  
10 plan may have to be revised next year. There might be  
11 a new statute that reserves large amounts of old growth  
12 on the Willamette Forest and it would just throw the  
13 whole thing into a new circumstance.

14 There is a provision for amendments  
15 which, in this case, are minor things, so you just  
16 amend the plan, and it's a less arduous process. You  
17 do have to have public involvement, but they're usually  
18 minor, sometimes just to correct a mistake in data or a  
19 mistake in the boundary, some little thing.

20 MS. SWENARCHUK: Q. Mr. Smith, in the  
21 record of decision which is Exhibit 1754B, is there not  
22 another brief summary of public involvement at page 2?

23 A. That's correct.

24 MS. SWENARCHUK: That may be helpful to  
25 the Board as well.

1 MADAM CHAIR: B?

2 MS. SWENARCHUK: Yes. The small book,  
3 the record of decision on page 2.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

5 MS. SWENARCHUK: Q. Go ahead.

6 A. In that respect the record of  
7 decision is the deciding officer's rationale and final  
8 decision. This is the regional forester talking, he  
9 has reviewed this plan that the forest supervisor  
10 prepared and then he provides the rationale for  
11 approving a particular alternative and plan, and in it  
12 he simple raises, you know, some of the key activities  
13 and issues.

14 So that the public involvement portion at  
15 the top of that page 2 is kind of a summary of this  
16 entire Appendix II of the draft environmental statement  
17 public involvement process.

18 Okay. So the regulations and the  
19 direction are not all that prescriptive about what a  
20 forester supervisor will do to acquire this public  
21 input, but the requirement is there and he has to  
22 design a public involvement process that will work for  
23 his particular area.

24 And in the case of the Willamette, the  
25 announcements, the schedule, the kind of encouragement,

1 the progress reports, they also conducted a number of  
2 workshops. The workshops were designed to help inform  
3 and educate the public about what was going on, about  
4 how the process would operate and where they could  
5 enter into it and have a reasonable chance of  
6 influencing, you know, what happened.

7 So workshops normally would be in various  
8 communities around the forest, they would be announced  
9 in advance, there would be forest planners present,  
10 they would be at various times of the day, normally in  
11 a community you would have one during the day and  
12 evening so that people would have the chance to come  
13 there when they were able to come, and there would be  
14 forest planners there ready to explain the process, the  
15 steps, the findings, the data, whatever, to describe  
16 what was coming next and invite participation.

17 There were records kept of these, sort of  
18 informal records of what people were saying. Those  
19 were brought back to the interdisciplinary planning  
20 team and presumably somehow got into the mix.

21 Now, obviously everything isn't relevant.  
22 Sometimes people say things that really are not  
23 pertinent to the issue, other times they say things  
24 that are, and so there are some judgments that ensue at  
25 that point. Sometimes the Forest Service does well at



1 that; sometimes they don't do so well, it depends on  
2 who is there and what the issues are.

3 There are also so-called public meetings  
4 and public meetings are sort of informal hearings. The  
5 Forest Service tends to favour more informal public  
6 meetings as opposed to public hearings. Hearings in  
7 the U.S. implies a court recorder, a lot of structure,  
8 somebody sitting like you are listening to a public and  
9 each person comes up one at a time, makes a statement,  
10 it's properly recorded and then made a matter of the  
11 record. There is many more public meetings than there  
12 are public hearings, and a public meeting can be almost  
13 the same kind of process with a lot less structure and  
14 probably not a transcript prepared for it, but a lot of  
15 dialogue begins to flow back and forth.

16 Another feature and one that I think you  
17 find growing in response and more dominating the whole  
18 issue of public involvement are facilitative meetings,  
19 and what that means is you bring people who are  
20 interested in this plan, groups and individuals and all  
21 perspectives, bring them together and you begin to  
22 discuss the issues and the questions and the options  
23 and discuss the work. If the work is to develop  
24 alternatives, you bring people together to help, you  
25 know, formulate those alternatives.

1                   Often we use an outside professional  
2           facilitator, one who does not work for the Forest  
3           Service, does not represent the timber industry or the  
4           environmentalist but is a professional in facilitating  
5           consensus building, and the forest supervisor then and  
6           his staff become just part of the group and they really  
7           try to take a particular issue, for example, and come  
8           up with consensus that then will go into the planning  
9           process.

10                   The forest Service is still responsible  
11           and accountable for the decision and it's still  
12           responsible for staying within the law and within the  
13           constraints of the lands. We can't do things that  
14           people ask us to do if it's unlawful or if it abuses  
15           the land, but we found that this is the best means of  
16           really dealing with conflict.

17                   It's a little bit like comparing  
18           inter-disciplinary planning with multidiscipline  
19           planning. If you remember I talked about how  
20           multidiscipline planning you get all these views coming  
21           into me the decision-maker and I make up my mind.  
22           Interdisciplinary planning and decision-making is  
23           everybody with ideas and contributions gets together  
24           and decides as a body that this is what we should do, a  
25           consensus develops.

1                   MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me, Mr. Smith. Then  
2       where does the regional forester come in; who writes  
3       the record of decision approving the final plan?

4                   THE WITNESS: The regional forester is  
5       what we call the deciding officer, he is not the  
6       planning level. The forest supervisor oversees the  
7       planning activity, the planning, it is the planning  
8       level forester that is, but his superior actually  
9       approves the plan and the forest supervisor from time  
10      to time goes to see the regional forester and they talk  
11      about it, you know, how are you doing, and he measures  
12      success and, what are the big problems and, of course,  
13      the regional forester gets involved in a kind of  
14      informal way at that point in advising and counselling  
15      and the regional forester staff assists the forest  
16      supervisor where they need additional skills, broader  
17      perspectives and so forth, but the forest supervisor is  
18      responsible for developing the plan and all the process  
19      that leads up to the plan, the regional forester simply  
20      says: Okay, I approve of that.

21                  MADAM CHAIR: The regional forester would  
22      never disapprove it?

23                  THE WITNESS: Oh yes, the regional  
24      forester often sends the forest supervisor back to the  
25      drawing board. Now, that doesn't happen at the last

1 moment. There are many interim steps where the  
2 regional forester staff is working with the forest  
3 staff to, you know, to measure progress, how are we  
4 doing, what sort of quality do we have, are we meeting  
5 the standards, and the forest supervisor from time to  
6 time comes in and talks about major issues, you know,  
7 what are the major conflicts here, what are the  
8 problems I'm encountering in resolving conflicts, what  
9 are the big options.

10 Each regional forester, forest supervisor  
11 develop their own relationships in keeping track of  
12 this, so that it's not like the forest supervisor  
13 devotes nine years comments and says: I want approval,  
14 and the regional forester says: I disapprove. That  
15 has never happened because there's been many interim  
16 little discussions.

17 MADAM CHAIR: And the forest supervisor  
18 sits at this table of experts that you have talked  
19 about and he or she is present all the time to hear  
20 these matters being worked out?

21 THE WITNESS: The answer to that is no,  
22 the forest supervisor is not a permanent member of the  
23 interdisciplinary team. The forest supervisor appoints  
24 the team from among his staff, her or her staff, and  
25 then the supervisor meets with that group frequently,



1 could be almost like every day, you know, there would  
2 be some kind of communication and touching base and  
3 certainly at key points there would be long and  
4 detailed discussion and review of the interdisciplinary  
5 team's work, but the forest supervisor is not a  
6 full-time member.

7 The forest supervisor, while all this is  
8 going on, is still cutting timber and providing  
9 recreation and watching the budgets and, you know,  
10 managing the whole operation, but it is at that level  
11 an important part of that forest supervisor's job and,  
12 in fact, when he or she gets a performance review a  
13 couple of times a year the regional forester talks  
14 about that, he says, you know, you're doing good work  
15 or bad work or excellent work, and they talk about the  
16 details of it.

17 So there has to be enough interaction  
18 among all the people to know, you know, how we are  
19 doing.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Mm-hmm. Another question,  
21 in an Ontario model we have evidence that if the  
22 planning team is unable to arrive at a decision, if  
23 there are two points of view, the district manager  
24 makes the final decision about which way to go. That's  
25 how we do it in Ontario. Does the forest supervisor do



1       that in your planning process?

2                   THE WITNESS: Yes, the answer to that is  
3       yes, although the forest supervisor becomes very  
4       unhappy when that has to happen. The forest supervisor  
5       would prefer to have the interdisciplinary team come up  
6       with two or three options that are workable and say,  
7       you know, we don't have consensus on which one is the  
8       best option, here are the pros and cons to these and,  
9       you know, the forest supervisor is always there to make  
10      that decision if it's necessary, but the preferred  
11      result is that the team hammers it out after the forest  
12      supervisor and the team discuss, you know, the major  
13      objectives, what are we trying to accomplish here and  
14      the team comes up with the best possible solution.

15                  Sometimes, as you know, solutions are not  
16      a hundred per cent good. I mean, there's kind of good  
17      and bad that goes with them, but they come up with what  
18      they believe to be the best possible solution. So I  
19      think that that would happen infrequently. I think  
20      most forest supervisors would just keep sending them  
21      back to the round table: Come on, let's hammer out a  
22      little better solution here that all of us can agree  
23      to. I don't want minority reports, I want a consensus.

24                  MR. MARTEL: Would they place before him  
25      the final or the best way of resolving whatever the

1 issue is?

2 THE WITNESS: That's correct. And, you  
3 know, I suppose that there's always the exception to  
4 that where a team just cannot come up with it and the  
5 forest supervisor in frustration will say: Well, this  
6 is the way it's going to be. He certainly has that  
7 authority, but we don't like that.

8 Back to the facilitative meetings then.  
9 What you get in a facilitative meeting is a a roomfull  
10 of people with a variety of negotiations and ideas  
11 about how their lands ought to be managed, it's a kind  
12 of interdisciplinary action among the mix and it's  
13 amazing how they're able to find common grounds.

14 Even the most ardent enviromentalist will  
15 finally, in a roomfull of people like that, agree that  
16 we should cut timber on the national forest, and even  
17 the most dyed-in-the-wool clearcut and burn artist,  
18 will agree that we ought to, you know, preserve some  
19 diversity and have some fisheries and this and that.

20 So what results is a great deal of common  
21 ground that is found and then there are fringes that  
22 really could be beyond the ability of the public to,  
23 you know, thrash out a consensus.

24 The forest supervisor doesn't have the  
25 same kind of authority over them as he does with his

1 own staff, he can't just keep telling them to go back  
2 and get it. Finally he's going to have to take the  
3 best he has and make a decision that, in his judgment,  
4 is the proper balance.

5 So that, you know, there will always be  
6 conflict and disagreement, but I think that can be  
7 greatly narrowed by this process and, in particular,  
8 facilitative meetings.

9 Something similar to that is actually  
10 little committees that crop up. A lot of times these  
11 are created by the public themselves and the Forest  
12 Service recognizes them and interfaces with them. On  
13 the Willamette they had a group called the fruitful  
14 discussion group and it was made up of leaders in the  
15 community that came from one end of the spectrum to the  
16 other and they met -- well, at certain times I think  
17 almost once a week, and other times maybe about once a  
18 month, and they would discuss these major issues and  
19 the forest supervisor was a member of the fruitful  
20 discussion group, but also two or three of the timber  
21 industry representatives and the Sierra Club and  
22 somebody from the university and somebody from the  
23 County Commissioner's office, and this turned out to be  
24 very, very good because they were able to find, you  
25 know, areas of agreement and common ground that then

1 allowed the forest supervisor, rather than hearing from  
2 this party and that party and trying to figure out what  
3 the best situation was, a lot of that was already  
4 integrated and kind of melded together into kind of a  
5 best possible situation.

6 When I was on the Willamette as forest  
7 supervisor we had a very difficult time with our sales  
8 program, it was almost brought to a halt. This was in  
9 the mid-70s. The environmentalists were challenging  
10 everything and finally we decided we would have a  
11 series of meetings, and we took our five-year sale  
12 action plan and we took a year at a time and we met in  
13 a neutral community and we called them sales and trails  
14 breakfasts and we just decided we were going to have  
15 breakfast together and spend at least half a day, if  
16 necessary, and try to reach agreement on sales.

17 And it worked and, as a result, the  
18 Willamette never missed its target on timber sales, but  
19 I can tell you they were done in a lot different way  
20 than what the Forest Service had originally envisaged,  
21 and when we got through with that we had the loggers  
22 and the Sierra Club talking to each other and  
23 collaborating on how best to do this to the  
24 satisfaction of both. And I know that story has been  
25 repeated many times on many different national forests.

1                   It's kind of a late development and all  
2       of the conflicts that have been dealt with in this plan  
3       were not handled that way, but a lot of them were, and  
4       the second generation of this plan will feature that,  
5       I'm sure to a much greater degree of facilitated  
6       meetings and committees of citizens working with the  
7       Forest Service on a kind of level playing field.

8                   Okay. The Board had a question in the  
9       interrogatories that dealt with general public, you  
10      know, how do you deal with the general public, the  
11      great silent majority that lives in Toronto that isn't  
12      next to these communities, and I suppose there's even a  
13      silent majority who live in the communities near the  
14      forest that aren't heard.

15                  That is a difficult question. The  
16      organized groups are much more vocal and much more  
17      skilled at dealing with the Forest Service. I think,  
18      again, you have to do all these things I mentioned to  
19      try to pull in the ordinary person who does have a  
20      stake in this, whether they believe it or not. I  
21      suspect that with the general public there has to be  
22      more emphasis on informing and educating to get people  
23      to invest the kinds of energies and resources  
24      necessary.

25                  In talking with the public involvement



1 experts that have been associated with planning, they  
2 tell me: Next time you'll have to do that you're going  
3 to have to spend more time educating and informing  
4 people and then drawing them in through these other  
5 means.

6 Okay. The next thing I want to do is  
7 tell you how we handle all this information that we get  
8 from the public. Maybe I should pause just for a  
9 moment and see if that's clear enough or...

10 MS. SWENARCHUK: Q. Go ahead.

11 A. Go ahead. Okay.

12 MR. MARTEL: No. Before you do, but the  
13 data -- I mean, you're having chats with people, but in  
14 fact who's compiling the data that is put before the  
15 public, as you're going along in this process  
16 somebody's gathering -- is that part of the role of the  
17 interdisciplinary team, or who starts to lay that  
18 material forward?

19 I mean, you can't discuss something in a  
20 vacuum.

21 THE WITNESS: Yes. Now, are you talking  
22 about the data that comes from--

23 MR. MARTEL: Yes.

24 THE WITNESS: --the public?

25 MR. MARTEL: No, not from the public.

1 THE WITNESS: Okay.

2 MR. MARTEL: I'm talking about the data  
3 involving what's on the land?

4 THE WITNESS: Okay. A good example.  
5 Let's say we're at the inventory stage where we need to  
6 talk about what is on the land. One method would be to  
7 call a series of workshops around in various  
8 communities where there's likely to be people that are  
9 interested and, even more important, people who might  
10 have information.

11 Again, you know, Forest Service people,  
12 particularly early in their career, tend to stay three  
13 or four years in one spot and then move on to another  
14 spot. You have people in the communities that have a  
15 history of three or four generations, they know the  
16 country really better than the Forest Service does.

17 So a forest supervisor might announce a  
18 series of workshops in various communities at different  
19 times and tell the folks that we're going to look at  
20 our inventory data, and this probably will be on maps,  
21 most likely on a series of maps, might convene a  
22 meeting in a room like this with maps plastered all  
23 over the walls, and you might have a station over there  
24 that has wildlife habitat and one over here that has  
25 stream information, or all the various aspects of data

1       that relate to lands and resources, and you might  
2       have -- with the wildlife habitat data or map, you  
3       might have a wildlife biologist sitting there and the  
4       room might be full of people just moving from station  
5       to station and talking about it, and the wildlife  
6       biologist might have a grease pencil on a transparency  
7       and he might mark it up with all this information  
8       coming in.

9                   Or somebody might say: That's exactly  
10       right, I'm glad to see you have that there. A lot of  
11       validation and a lot of sharing of information can  
12       occur in that format.

13                   That is the kind of thing I've seen  
14       happen most often, that is most productive. You can  
15       also issue in written form what you found and get  
16       people to comment back at their leisure, and that  
17       occurs as well.

18                   MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me, Mr. Smith. Did  
19       you read the MNR's process for obtaining that kind of  
20       information in their planning system with respect to  
21       obtaining information about values or areas of concern?

22                   THE WITNESS: I've read an awful lot of  
23       material from MNR. I recall that there was some  
24       activity like that that local people and citizens would  
25       offer information. I was left with the impression that

1 it was somewhat ad hoc; that is, you know, that they  
2 were invited to do that but there was not a  
3 particularly structured way of pulling it out, but that  
4 they were always amenable to hearing that and, as I  
5 recall, that kind of information, if appropriate, ended  
6 up in a kind of area of concern or a values map and,  
7 you know, when offered, I got the impression it was  
8 accepted if it was factual.

9 I don't recall reading a lot about a  
10 special program or effort to go out and glean every  
11 little bit that is available.

12 MADAM CHAIR: And how do you do that in  
13 the U.S. Forest Service?

14 THE WITNESS: We do it in a kind of a  
15 varied manner of success but just as I talked about  
16 here. We would -- you know, we have the basic  
17 responsibility to know the lands and gather the  
18 information and we would do that on these maps and  
19 summaries and then ask people to add to it, validate  
20 it, add to it. It.

21 Could be done in a workshop as I talked  
22 about, a roomfull of people going from station to  
23 station and just interacting, maybe one-on-one even  
24 and, you know, that really has turned out to be as good  
25 as anything. You can have a lot of one-on-one

1 discussions, you get a lot of valuable information.

2 But you can also do it in a kind of a  
3 broad way of issuing maps on inventory and just asking  
4 anybody that has information to provide you a  
5 validation or additions or modifications.

6 So I think you need all those kinds of  
7 things. Some of it depends on your local circumstance.  
8 If you're working with a community of 300 people you do  
9 something differ than you would for Toronto.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Mm-hmm.

11 THE WITNESS: And likely you would get a  
12 different kind of product too from that.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

14 Mr. Martel's question I think refers to  
15 page 4 on Exhibit 1753, your hand-drawn diagram where  
16 you go through the 10 steps where the public  
17 involvement is desired or sought for each of those  
18 steps.

19 THE WITNESS: My wiggly line?

20 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

21 THE WITNESS: Yes, all right.

22 MADAM CHAIR: And the Board is very  
23 interested in each of those steps, what you've put  
24 before the public or what you do to get their input.

25 And I think you started your explanation



1 by saying the first step would be the inventory phase  
2 which is in here or comes before these 10 steps?

3 THE WITNESS: No, it's in here. It would  
4 be step three, collecting data and information. That  
5 basically is the inventory.

6 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Now, how is the  
7 public involved in steps one and two?

8 THE WITNESS: Okay. The public in step  
9 one probably is more informed and educated in  
10 identifying the purpose and need of. A lot of that is  
11 rooted in statute and regulation, you know, why are we  
12 doing this anyway.

13 Somebody might say: Why are you going to  
14 all this effort for? Well, because it's required for  
15 one thing. We need to develop a plan that assures  
16 integration of resources, we need a plan that allows  
17 people to have an opportunity to influence it. Step  
18 one probably there is -- maybe it's weighted on the  
19 side of informing folks.

20 People may disagree with our  
21 interpretation of purpose and need and certainly  
22 there's an opportunity to provide advice and counsel at  
23 that point, or straighten us out so to speak, but I  
24 think you're leaning more towards informing and  
25 educating there.

1                   MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me. And is that  
2 done by way of special notices or are there legal  
3 requirements about how you do that first step?

4                   THE WITNESS: I don't know of any legal  
5 requirements on how to do that. I think the legal  
6 requirement is it must be done and the public, you  
7 know, the regulations it will be done early and  
8 continuously.

9                   You know, I think early means when you  
10 first get the idea you're going to start planning. You  
11 may have something to say about the schedule and the  
12 public might say, I don't like your schedule, it's not  
13 going to work, it's taking too long or it's not taking  
14 long enough or, you know...

15                  MR. MARTEL: But you have an inventory  
16 already at that process though; don't you, there is  
17 some sort of inventory?

18                  THE WITNESS: Yes.

19                  MR. MARTEL: You work with?

20                  THE WITNESS: Yes.

21                  MR. MARTEL: That is drafted primarily by  
22 your staff at the preliminary -- at the outset of the  
23 process?

24                  THE WITNESS: That's correct and it's not  
25 the beginning of the inventory either.

1 MR. MARTEL: No.

2 THE WITNESS: We have been in the  
3 business for nearly a hundred years now so, you know,  
4 we have accumulated an inventory that has been built  
5 upon. So you start with that and as we move along it  
6 becomes more detailed, more sophisticated. So you're  
7 adding to it, it's not like we suddenly just landed on  
8 this planet and we have got to go look at everything  
9 and start from scratch.

10 You know, we are already in the process,  
11 in fact we already have a plan, we have a 1977 plan  
12 that is in place and we are cutting timber every day,  
13 we're, you know, recreating and we're protecting and  
14 doing the whole thing. So it just slices at this point  
15 and says: Okay, we're going to take another look at  
16 it.

17 MADAM CHAIR: All right. So in some way  
18 you tell the public you're starting your planning  
19 process?

20 THE WITNESS: Yes.

21 MADAM CHAIR: And you don't know of  
22 anything very formal that is done other than notifying  
23 them about it and presumably giving them something to  
24 read?

25 THE WITNESS: Yes. In some sense it is

1 very formal because that process is initiated by an  
2 announcement in the Federal Register which is a  
3 government wide publication and it meets, you know,  
4 kind of a requirement of law that you notify everybody,  
5 but it would go in the newspapers, it would go to the  
6 forest supervisors mailing list. Every forest  
7 supervisor has a mailing list of people who are  
8 interested in what's going on in the forest. Generally  
9 for a forest like the Willamette it might be 500 people  
10 and groups that gets a mailing.

11 There probably would not be a public  
12 meeting because at that point there may not be enough  
13 to talk about, it is really influenced that much, but  
14 it could be. If there was intense interest in it, it  
15 might be that the forest supervisor would call a public  
16 meeting and just explain what the planning process was  
17 about.

18 He might issue some of these little  
19 informal progress reports, the little newsletters that  
20 would come from the Willamette telling people: Well,  
21 here we are, we are going to start the process of  
22 planning. It is required by these statutes and these  
23 regulations, here's the schedule, here's what to  
24 expect, here's the role that we see for you, this is  
25 what, you know, your expectations should be in terms of

1       being able to influence this, those kinds of things.

2                   I think there's a number of techniques  
3       and they do vary from forest to forest and community to  
4       community, but the key thing is that whatever will work  
5       with that public is done or should be done and not  
6       ignored.

7                   MADAM CHAIR: All right. And the second  
8       step, prepare planning criteria, what does the public  
9       do about that?

10                  THE WITNESS: There, you know, you're  
11       beginning to deal with the issues, you know, what are  
12       the criteria that are going to be used to determine  
13       whether you've successfully planned.

14                  And this is going to vary a lot forest to  
15       forest. On one forest wilderness it might be, you  
16       know, the biggest issue of a lot of roadless areas and  
17       everybody knows that some wilderness is going to be  
18       designated, there has been a lot of interest and demand  
19       for wilderness, that might be a big feature; on another  
20       forest it might be the level of timber harvest, timber  
21       harvest are important because it affects the landscape  
22       more than probably anything except road building and  
23       communities are dependent upon it, there's industries  
24       already developed that depend on it.

25                  You identify issues and you begin to get



1 a sense of what criteria are going to be used to  
2 measure whether a plan is going to result in a balance  
3 and a proper management of a national forest.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Is the Forest Service  
5 asking the public what they think the issues are at  
6 this point?

7 THE WITNESS: Yes, and that is critical  
8 because in this particular planning process it's often  
9 said that it's driven by issues, it's issue driven and  
10 I personally agree with that, to an extent.

11 I think sometimes there's more than  
12 immediate issues the Forest Service ought to deal with,  
13 you know, the basic land purposes - and I don't want to  
14 use issues again - but things other than just the  
15 current kind of problems or controversies, that sort of  
16 thing, it's got to be more than that.

17 But certainly those are the things that  
18 must be resolved in this plan, how much timber harvest  
19 or how much wilderness, are we going to have  
20 clearcutting, what kind of -- how are we going to  
21 handle threatened and endangered species, what about  
22 biodiversity, is it important - I think it is - what  
23 are we going to do about.

24 So there's a whole collection of things  
25 that the public is critical of because if we fail to

1 address their issues we can go through this entire  
2 planning process and not arrive at the finish line,  
3 there would still be all these things up in the air.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Now, with which techniques  
5 does the Forest Service ask people to identify issues,  
6 what specifically do they do to get that kind of  
7 participation?

8 THE WITNESS: What I have observed, and  
9 again there's no cookbook recipe for this - the Forest  
10 Service talks about a variety of activities that can be  
11 used but doesn't prescribe any - but what I've seen is  
12 public meetings, public workshops, you know, issuing a  
13 notice that these appear to be the primary issues, what  
14 do you think, so that they can get written comment  
15 back, additions, validation of those, modifications.

16 These committees that form, sort of  
17 interest groups, contacts with them, for example. I'm  
18 sure the forest supervisor of the Willamette went to  
19 the timber industry associations, went to the Sierra  
20 Club, went to the outdoor clubs, went to the fish and  
21 game commission of Oregon, went to all the agencies,  
22 interest groups and individuals they could think of to  
23 say: What do you think the issues are, here are some  
24 that we believe should be included, what do you think.

25 And, you know, again I think it's a

1 combination of all those things and the forest  
2 supervisor eventually has to judge when he thinks he's  
3 done it, that he really has a handle on it.

4 But in the case of the Willamette, the  
5 Forest Service I think gave adequate feedback to the  
6 public so that they knew what they had decided. They  
7 didn't have to wait until the plan came out to find  
8 that out, they found out right there in this step, that  
9 they got a report back to the stockholder.

10 MADAM CHAIR: In your second generation  
11 of plans will you have time limits or scheduling on how  
12 long these various steps will take?

13 THE WITNESS: Yes, and we did on the  
14 original plan too, but it took us far longer than we  
15 thought it would.

16 I think what will happen in the second  
17 generation of these plans, we will issue a schedule  
18 again, I have a feeling that we will be able to predict  
19 what that schedule is more accurately than we were at  
20 this time, the process kept changing, we kept finding  
21 out new things, we learned how to walk during this  
22 process.

23 MADAM CHAIR: All right. We're at the  
24 third step then of collecting data and information.

25 THE WITNESS: And I think that is the one

1 we talked about the inventory, where you might fill the  
2 room up with people and have all the inventories  
3 posted around with somebody there to talk to folks and  
4 record it, you know, on a piece of paper or on the map.

5 That information then, the validation and  
6 the addition or modification of inventory data would  
7 then go back to the planning team and they would  
8 correct their database to reflect the new findings.

9 Now, you know, I think sometimes people  
10 are going to tell you things that aren't accurate and  
11 there has to be some Forest Service validation of that  
12 too. In the U.S. we have groups that have strategies,  
13 they would prefer to say things that are maybe not  
14 totally valid in order to get the Forest Service to  
15 move one direction or the other. So there has to be  
16 some validation of that, but at the same time, once  
17 that is done, there would be some feedback to the  
18 public so that they know what the Forest Service did  
19 with it.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Now, this is the third time  
21 you've asked the public to do something and presumably  
22 they are three separate points in time?

23 THE WITNESS: At least. We may go back  
24 two or three times on each of these steps and some of  
25 the steps certainly don't lend themselves to one

1 meetings or one set of activities, you might do it and  
2 then come back and do it again because they are too  
3 complicated.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Now, in the schedule how  
5 long would you see those three steps taking, six  
6 months, three months, a year?

7 THE WITNESS: You're getting me out on  
8 pretty uncertain grounds right now. I would say that  
9 the first three steps could be completed in six months.

10 Now, that preassumes that there has been  
11 a lot of data collection, you know, it's already in  
12 hand. You know, we know a lot about these lands  
13 already, so we're not going out and conducting new  
14 inventories, we're combining the inventories that we  
15 have, going to the public and, you know, sharpening  
16 them up, extending them.

17 I should think that first part, you know,  
18 it depends on the circumstances, but certainly six  
19 months maybe even quite a lot sooner, maybe three  
20 months.

21 In dealing with the public you can't --  
22 it's not like calling your staff together tomorrow, I  
23 mean, you have to give them a certain amount of time,  
24 people have to arrange their own schedule. So, you  
25 know, it does draw out the period, there's no question.



1 That's a tradeoff you might say and a cost of  
2 accomplishing it but, you know, it's fatal if you  
3 don't.

4 MR. COSMAN: Madam Chair, I'm sorry, I  
5 think I misunderstood that question. Is your question  
6 how much time under the schedule that there was had  
7 been allocated for the first three steps? I wasn't  
8 sure.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Smith, I don't think  
10 you could answer how much time originally because it  
11 was exceeded in the Willamette plan.

12 THE WITNESS: Yes.

13 MADAM CHAIR: We were talking about, in  
14 his opinion today, how long does he think it would take  
15 to go through those three steps.

16 MR. FREIDIN: Is that the first  
17 generation plans or the second generation plans, Madam  
18 Chairman?

19 MADAM CHAIR: Well, he's saying he  
20 doesn't know how long it took in the first generation  
21 plans.

22 THE WITNESS: I think that was so muddled  
23 with issuing the new direction, backing up, trying,  
24 experimenting, getting buddied up and having to go back  
25 and do it again that it would be hard to say.

1                   Probably the forest supervisor if he were  
2                   sitting here he could give you a better idea, but I'm  
3                   saying, you know, maybe three to six months if we were  
4                   to do it today.

5                   MADAM CHAIR: All three steps?

6                   THE WITNESS: All three steps.

7                   MADAM CHAIR: That sort of astonishes us.  
8                   I guess, we find it takes that much time just to  
9                   arrange one or two public meetings. That seems like a  
10                  very short amount of time to do extensive consultation.

11                  THE WITNESS: Right. We're talking  
12                  about, our hope is that we can accomplish planning in a  
13                  couple of years, the total planning in the next  
14                  generation.

15                  Certainly we could not have done that  
16                  with this, and looking at where you are in your  
17                  evolution of planning and the detail that you probably  
18                  will be striving for, it's going to take longer. But,  
19                  you know, I think that is an acceptable cost.

20                  MR. MARTEL: Well, we have forest  
21                  management agreements every five years, our plan is 20  
22                  and renewable every five and you can have an annual  
23                  work schedule, that's done annually, so it's hard to  
24                  compare the two. But it's much -- timber management.  
25                  Pardon me. Not an FMA, a timber management plan, but

1 it's much more frequent that it's updated.

2 THE WITNESS: We, by the way, have that  
3 too. You know, we have an annual program of work, we  
4 have a five-year action plan for timber harvest.

5 MR. MARTEL: Okay.

6 THE WITNESS: That is brought up --  
7 actually it's a kind of rolling timber harvest  
8 five-year action plan, we add a year and drop a year  
9 every year.

10 So there's probably some analogous things  
11 happening there, but I'm talking now about the big  
12 integrated resource plan that happens once every 10 to  
13 15 years.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Perhaps, Ms. Swenarchuk, we  
15 will stop for the day now.

16 MS. SWENARCHUK: Okay.

17 MADAM CHAIR: And how much longer do you  
18 think it would be before you finish with Mr. Smith?  
19 And we still are interested in going through all the  
20 steps of this process with respect to what's done and  
21 how long it takes.

22 MS. SWENARCHUK: I would think we would  
23 finish in the early afternoon. There are other  
24 subjects to discuss as well. That would be my estimate  
25 at this the time.

1                   MADAM CHAIR: All right. Dr. Quinney,  
2 will you be ready to follow?

3                   DR. QUINNEY: Yes, indeed, Madam Chair.

4                   MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. All right. We  
5 will reconvene at nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

6                   THE WITNESS: All right.

7                   MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

8                   THE WITNESS: Thank you.

9                   ---Whereupon the hearing was adjourned at 4:00 p.m., to  
10 be reconvened on Tuesday, March 26th, 1991,  
commencing at 9:00 a.m.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 [c. copyright, 1985]













